



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 2022

No. 101

Senate

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable ALEX PADILLA, a Senator from the State of California.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, help us to so live that the generations to come will know of Your mighty acts.

Today, give our lawmakers the singularity of heart to seek, find, and follow Your will so that their legacy will be exemplary.

Lord, guide them in the path You have created, inspiring them with the potency of your powerful presence.

May they trust You in times of adversity and prosperity, knowing that they will reap a productive harvest if they persevere. Keep them from underestimating the power of Your great Name.

We pray in the Name of our redeemer. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 14, 2022.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable ALEX PADILLA, a Senator from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PADILLA thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

HONORING OUR PROMISE TO ADDRESS COMPREHENSIVE TOXICS ACT OF 2021—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Also, under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 3967, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3967) to improve health care and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Tester-Moran amendment No. 5051, in the nature of a substitute.

Schumer amendment No. 5065 (to amendment No. 5051), to add an effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 5076 (to the text proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 5051), to add an effective date.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, as we speak, the U.S. Senate is working on

something not seen since the time we passed the Brady bill I authored nearly three decades ago: a bipartisan effort to draft meaningful gun safety legislation.

For decades, the rhythms of the gun debate in Congress have followed a dispiriting pattern: a mass shooting takes place somewhere in America, innocent people are slaughtered, families grieve and demand action, but gridlock takes over, and nothing—nothing—gets done. This was the cycle of inaction after Sandy Hook, Las Vegas, Orlando, Charleston, Parkland, El Paso, Atlanta, Pittsburgh, and so many others. But after Uvalde and Buffalo, perhaps—perhaps—this time could be different.

To many Senators on both sides, this debate certainly feels different. With Sunday's announcement of a bipartisan framework for gun legislation, we are further down the road to gun safety reform than we have been in a long time.

I spoke with Senators CORNYN and MURPHY this morning, and they updated me on their progress. They are working with the urgency the situation demands, and they are hopeful the legislative text can be finalized in the coming days.

I have assured my colleagues that once we get legislative text to a gun safety bill, I will move to hold a vote on the Senate floor as soon as possible.

I hope that in the very near future, Democrats and Republicans can take the real momentum of the past few weeks and translate it into something that has escaped this Chamber for decades: voting on and passing long-sought gun safety reform.

It is a rare opportunity for the Senate. So in order to reach our goal, we have to keep working with the same urgency and good faith that has carried us this far.

For sure, the bipartisan framework is far from perfect, but if passed, it will unquestionably save lives and would be the most significant action on guns that the Senate has taken in nearly

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S2919

three decades. If passed, it would enhance background checks for those under 21. It will help States with their red flag laws, preventing shootings before they happen. It will make it harder for domestic abusers to acquire a weapon by closing the boyfriend loophole.

Significantly, this framework also calls for new punishment for gun traffickers. We all know one of the biggest weaknesses in our country's gun laws as they are today is that anyone can buy a gun in one State and then simply smuggle it into another. We could begin to fight against that with stiffer penalties on gun trafficking.

Of course, this framework will help lower crime and reduce gun violence in our neighborhoods by increasing funding for mental health as well. And even on its own, funding for mental health with great increases in mental health problems that we see after COVID is very much needed.

Taken together, the policies outlined by the bipartisan framework would be an important first step to saving lives. It would lay the foundation for a more sensible approach to gun safety in the future. It certainly is not everything Democrats want, but if we can save even one life—one life—our efforts will have been worth it.

I hope that very soon the Senate can break the cycle of violence, grieving, and gridlock that has held firm for far too long. This is the best chance we have had in years to finally tell the American people that, yes, after the horrifying tragedies of Uvalde and Buffalo, this time—this time—will be different.

We have more work to do so I urge my colleagues not to let this precious opportunity slip away.

H.R. 3967

Mr. President, now on the PACT Act, today, the Senate will continue consideration of the Honoring Our PACT Act—the most ambitious and important expansion of veteran healthcare benefits that we have seen in decades.

Yesterday, we invoked cloture on the substitute amendment to the PACT Act with a very strong bipartisan vote, 78 to 17. Seventy-eight votes, a clear indication that both sides want this bill passed through the Senate. There is no reason to delay that outcome.

Today, we will continue working with our Republican colleagues to see if we can speed up consideration of this legislation. With Republican cooperation, we could be done with the PACT Act as soon as tomorrow.

We need to pass the PACT Act ASAP because our veterans have waited long enough for their healthcare benefits to treat complications from toxic exposure. Over the last two decades, an estimated 3.5 million servicemembers were exposed to dangerous chemicals while in the line of duty while risking their lives for us.

Burn pits were a common method of eliminating all sorts of waste throughout Iraq and Afghanistan, from every-

day trash to hazardous and poisonous materials. After returning home, many veterans developed terrible diseases because of their exposure to these toxic waste dumps. But even so, nearly 80 percent of all disability claims related to burn pits have been denied by the Veterans' Administration. What an indignity. What an injustice. No veteran should ever have to carry the burden of treating complications from toxic exposure alone, and we can change that with this bill.

There is every reason in the world to get the PACT Act done quickly. Both parties want it, our veterans deserve it, and the time is long past for us to make a change at the VA.

OCEAN SHIPPING REFORM ACT

Mr. President, on shipping, last night, finally, the House overwhelmingly approved the Senate's Ocean Shipping Reform Act—the most significant maritime reform law passed by Congress in years.

The inflation-fighting shipping bill now goes to the President's desk for signature, finally providing relief to American exporters and consumers alike.

Shipping reform is exactly the kind of bill that can make a difference to the American people: It fights inflation. It relieves our supply chains. It helps small businesses and consumers alike. Not too much has been written about this bill because, sadly, the way our world and media work, if there is not a big conflict, they don't write much about it. But this is very important.

If high prices are our No. 1 nemesis, one of the main reasons is the ships piled up at our ports. We have all seen the pictures outside the ports of L.A. and Seattle and Savannah and Norfolk and New York, New Jersey. This is causing people to pay more. It is no one's fault. It is COVID-related, and now there is a big rush to make up for the delays that COVID caused.

We have to do something about it, and we have. There are many frustrating reasons why prices are going up right now, but one of the main ones is abuses from ocean carriers.

Over the course of the pandemic—listen to this, folks. Over the course of the pandemic, unfair shipping practices led carriers to increase prices by as much as 1,000 percent—1,000-percent increase in prices in shipping. And who is paying that? The average family in America and the average exporting business.

Even worse, foreign carriers often-times refuse to even transport U.S. goods overseas. And by now we are seeing the results: backlogs at the ports of L.A. and Seattle and Georgia and New York and New Jersey and other major hubs.

This is not just a problem for the coasts. When backlog occurs at the ports in Los Angeles, it hurts farmers in Minnesota or Wisconsin. It hurts truckers and tech companies and manufacturers in mom-and-pop shops all

over the country. And most of all, it hurts American consumers.

Our shipping reform bill will fix this by making it harder for ocean carriers to unreasonably refuse American goods at our ports, while strengthening the Federal Maritime Commission's powers to stop abusive practices by foreign carriers.

I want to thank Speaker PELOSI and my House colleagues who worked to pass this bill. And special thanks goes to Senators KLOBUCHAR and THUNE for authoring the legislation, as well Chairman CANTWELL who used her legislative skills, which are indeed very, very fine. She shepherded the bill through this Chamber. Because of the hard work of these folks, shipping reform will now become law. American consumers will soon feel the benefit.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

CRIME

Mr. MCCONNELL. A few months ago, from this desk, I talked about the results of a recall election in San Francisco. In February, a multilingual, multiethnic coalition in San Francisco stood up for common sense and rejected three members of the far-left school board who had prioritized woke lunacy over the basics of education.

Well, last week, these same fed-up citizens provided a sequel. Even the deep-blue Bay area decided they had had enough—enough—with their radical-left district attorney—a prosecutor in name only—who had become nationally famous for running a soft-on-crime experiment.

As deaths from drug overdoses skyrocketed, his office chose to almost entirely stop prosecuting drug dealing. Burglaries shot up 50 percent. Chain stores had to close locations because of rampant shoplifting. One person who had been arrested five times in 6 months in 2020 was let out every time—every single time—until he killed two women with a stolen car. Liberals actually bragged about how they had cut down incarceration rates, even as disorder swallowed up more and more of the city.

The citizens were fed up—fed up—with being the far-left's guinea pigs. They flocked to the ballot box, and they voted for change.

This phenomenon is not only playing out in San Francisco, it is nationwide—nationwide. For years, the far left has zeroed in on local prosecutors and district attorneys as juicy opportunities to make America radically softer on crime.

According to recent news reports, for example, one far-left billionaire donated more than \$1 million each to the political campaigns of soft-on-crime prosecutors in Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia. According to one group's analysis, the army of soft-on-crime prosecutors supported by this one donor—this one donor—and his networks oversees as much as 20 percent of the Nation's entire population.

Once in office, many of these prosecutors set about abusing their authority by basically unilaterally decriminalizing various crimes that neither voters nor legislators have actually decriminalized in reality. As the attorney general of Virginia put it recently, "Instead of trying to change the law . . . these groups are electing prosecutors who simply ignore it."

As this liberal campaign has been playing out at the State and local level, we have seen violent crime surge all across the country. Here are just a few recent news reports.

From Minnesota: "Robberies, assaults, and gun crimes are causing waves of anxiety and fear among suburban residents across the Twin Cities."

From Colorado: "Since the beginning of the pandemic . . . murders had gone up 47 percent, some types of property crime had nearly doubled, and [the] seizures of fentanyl and methamphetamine had quadrupled" in just the last year.

Atlanta "saw a 30-year record in homicides last year [in 2021]," and 2022 has been looking actually even worse. At least as of a few months ago, both murders and rapes were way ahead of even that 2021 pace.

Residents of Phoenix who try to use public transit to escape soaring gas prices have found out that "assaults and drug crime in and around public transportation have risen over the last five years."

Philadelphia is reporting an 80-percent increase in assaults aboard buses.

In my hometown of Louisville, we are struggling as well. "Over the past several years, violent crime has sharply risen across the city, breaking gruesome records including record homicides and assaults." And we have seen carjacking "more than triple in the [last] five years." Last weekend alone—last weekend alone—Louisville saw 3 homicides and 10 nonfatal shootings. Five teenagers and a 9-year-old were shot during a single altercation at my hometown's Big Four Bridge. Violent criminals turned a popular attraction for families and tourists into a literal war zone.

Stable prices, border security, and public safety are three of the most basic deliverables that any government owes to its citizens—strike one, strike two, and strike three for Democrats at the Federal, State, and local level.

That explains one last headline I will mention this morning: "Americans are more worried about crime than at any other time this century."

UKRAINE

Mr. President, now on a different matter, the latest news from Ukraine confirms that our friends need more robust weaponry, and they need it fast.

"Outgunned Ukraine Needs More Weapons Fast as Russia Advances, Officials Say."

"Ukraine Pleads for Weapons, Saying Russia Has Much More Artillery."

The people of Ukraine have inspired the world with their resilience, but resisting Russian aggression takes reliable supplies of lethal force.

As the Biden administration continues to provide shipments and prod our allies, they must adopt the kind of strong and positive posture that has eluded them at earlier points in the conflict.

As early as last November, I was urging sanctions for deterrence and pushing for NDAA provisions to send enhanced lethal aid last November. Throughout December and January, I urged the President to bolster NATO's eastern flank with more U.S. forces and get more weapons to Ukrainian forces before—before—Russia attacked. In February, I called on President Biden to anticipate Russian manipulation of the energy markets and back off his own holy war against domestic American production. But for months, the Biden administration seemed mute, seemed actually more focused on deterring itself than deterring Putin—too much hesitation, too much hemming and hawing, too little preventive action in advance.

The United States cannot make the same mistakes again with prolonged dithering over whether to provide longer range or more powerful weapons. That is where we are now. It is time to get Ukraine what it needs to finish this fight, including artillery and long-range rockets, and strongly and firmly push our European allies to do the same. The wealthiest European countries need to move fast to do their part—no more hesitation, and quit making excuses.

This war has carried terrible human costs for the Ukrainian people. We cannot bring back the thousands who have been lost, but with strong assistance, we can help Ukraine limit future losses, reduce the risk of greater conflict, and create a deterring precedent for other would-be aggressors, like China.

There is another area where the Ukraine crisis has showcased the need to take decisive action quickly while there is still time. That is with respect to our own defense industrial base and our supplies of critical arms.

Equipping Ukraine has seriously depleted our own stockpiles of Javelins and Stingers. According to the Secretary of the Army, the U.S. military has "taken some risk to our own readiness." This sounds exactly like the sort of situation that prompted the creation of the Defense Production Act, but thus far, we have heard far more from Washington Democrats about using the

DPA to fast-track green energy boondoggles than to expand production capacity for critical weapons and munitions.

Our allies and our partners are interested in buying American military technology. This should be a win-win: allies spending their own money to strengthen themselves by buying American and making our militaries more interoperable in the process. But too often, our partners are hamstrung by American constraints on the process, like the heel-dragging bureaucracy that runs our military sales, and lagging production schedules.

We must adequately stockpile weapons and munitions for our own military and have sufficient supplies and production capacity to arm our friends, and we need to do this before it is too late.

Building up our own stores and upgrading our allies' is the best way we can avoid nightmare scenarios down the road where America could be forced into a terrible choice between committing U.S. troops to a conflict or doing nothing. The remedy is to help our allies upgrade their military capabilities in advance.

Of course, this takes money. All the serious preparations and military modernization that it will take to compete with Russia and China require resources. Tomorrow, the Armed Services Committee will mark up the National Defense Authorization Act. This is a key opportunity to show that both parties are serious about the real growth in defense spending that it will take to keep us on the cutting edge.

The Biden administration's defense budget request was woefully insufficient. The President has proposed a real-dollar cut for defense spending after President Biden's own inflation.

Our colleagues on the committee must help Congress to deliver an NDAA that provides for real, robust growth above inflation so that we can modernize our forces, ensure adequate inventories of critical weapons and munitions, and keep America safe.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JANUARY 6

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is hard to believe it was 50 years ago this week—50 years ago—when five men were caught breaking into the offices of the Democratic National Committee here in Washington.

Two years after that, the so-called Watergate break-in and the coverup by the Nixon White House, it brought down the President.

For nearly half a century, the Watergate scandal really ranked as America's greatest constitutional test since

the Civil War—then came January 6, 2021.

An angry mob, summoned by a defeated President, attacked this Capitol building, attacked this Chamber, and those of us who were in it knew it was an attempt to overthrow an election, an election which Donald Trump lost but never admitted.

How did we respond?

Well, the proposal was made—the right proposal—to create a bipartisan commission to investigate what happened on January 6, 2021. Unfortunately, the Republicans, led by Senator MCCONNELL in the Senate, filibustered the creation of an independent commission to investigate January 6. Fortunately, the House went forward to proceed on its own on a bipartisan basis to get to the truth.

Now, after 11 months and 1,000 interviews—more than 1,000—the bipartisan Select Committee to Investigate the January 6 Attack on the U.S. Capitol is sharing its findings with America, and the revelations are so damning.

In its first two public hearings, the committee has shown that the attack on the Capitol was not a demonstration that changed spontaneously and became a riot. The attack on our Nation's Capitol, the attack on this Chamber, was the result of a plan: a violent effort to prevent the peaceful transfer of power from the Trump administration to the Biden administration, to stop the peaceful transition of power in America for the first time in our history.

To quote Congresswoman LIZ CHENEY, the former President Donald Trump “summoned the mob, assembled the mob, and lit the flame of this attack.”

When the mob beat our police officers and ransacked the Capitol—going through our desks here on the floor, posing for pictures where the Presiding Officer is now sitting, all sorts of things to make them look famous with their friends at the expense of the integrity of this building and this Chamber.

They beat the police officers. Donald Trump did nothing to stop them—nothing. He wouldn't order the National Guard to defend the Capitol, the Senate, the House. He watched the mayhem on TV, rewinding it to watch it over and over again. He gloried in the moment.

When the crowd threatened to hang Vice President Pence, Donald Trump said, “He deserves it.” Deserves it. The Vice President of the United States deserves it.

His own advisers told him repeatedly that the voter fraud conspiracy theories that he was peddling were false. They were called “idiotic,” “amateurish,” “detached from reality.” Who said that? The former Attorney General serving Donald Trump said it in describing the false claims that President Trump continued to pedal.

Donald Trump was told the truth over and over again, and yet he continued to push his deadly Big Lie.

He deliberately—the former President of the United States—deliberately undermined America's faith in our election process to overturn the election and to hold onto power no matter what.

He used the Big Lie to make big bucks. We learned that yesterday—quarter of a million dollars—quarter of a billion dollars in donations, including millions of dollars for an election defense fund that didn't exist.

In a coming hearing, the committee will show how Donald Trump pressured the Justice Department into helping him overturn the election. I know a little bit about that. Our Senate Judiciary Committee, which I chair, documented this attempt to subvert the Justice Department in an 8-month investigation and report that we produced last fall. We produced this report in a bipartisan fashion, inviting Republican and Democratic Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee to witness the testimony of key individuals and to ask questions themselves.

We interviewed former Justice officials like Jeffrey Rosen and Richard Donoghue, the then-acting Attorney General and Deputy Attorney General, who resisted Donald Trump's pressure to take over the Justice Department.

They told us how repeatedly they informed the former President that his bogus election claims were false. They told us how Trump, nevertheless, asked the Justice Department to “Just say the election was corrupt—and leave the rest to me and Republican Congressmen.”

And they resisted Donald Trump's plan to replace Jeffrey Rosen with the Big Lie lawyer Jeffrey Clark, who wanted the Justice Department to help overturn the election.

The facts that the Senate Judiciary Committee uncovered are damning. The January 6 committee will unveil those—many of their own discovery and reporting and some that we sent to them from our testimony that we gathered in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

We came close to losing this democracy in America on January 6. I believe that by laying out the truth for us and for future generations, members of the committee are performing a public service of heroic proportions.

It is sad—sad—that given an opportunity of a bipartisan commission, just as we had with 9/11, that the Senate Republicans stopped it. Why? It is a question they are going to have to answer.

POLITICAL PRISONERS

Mr. President, on another topic, we speak often in the Senate about threats to peace and freedom around the world: Russia's unprovoked invasion of Ukraine, China's brutal repression of the Uighurs, the dismantling of democracy in Hong Kong, Nicaragua's repressive dictatorship, and more.

In each of these struggles, there are some brave men and women who are prepared to risk their liberty and their lives to defend democracy and dignity.

Many of them languish in prison as political prisoners. Their captors often try to torment them by telling them: The world has forgotten you; no one knows you are here.

Well, I want to make sure that that doesn't happen by coming to floor of the Senate and sharing some of these stories. Today, let me tell you about a few of them.

Let me start with a Russian opposition leader of remarkable courage: Vladimir Kara-Murza. He was poisoned twice by the Russian spy agency FSB, in 2015 and 2017. He not only survived that, but he continued his work for a democratic Russia.

He was a close friend of Senator John McCain, who asked him personally to serve as a pallbearer at his funeral.

I met Mr. Kara-Murza in March, 3 weeks before Russia invaded Ukraine. He was living in Washington at the time with his wife and three children, and he told me he was going back to Russia. He had work to do.

On April 11, he was arrested in Moscow, 1 day after giving an interview in which he called Vladimir Putin's government a “team of murderers.”

His wife, Evgenia Kara-Murza, also an advocate for democracy in Russia, who I expect to meet with later on this week, said: “He's doing as well as you can do in a Russian prison that is notorious for torture, humiliation, and mistreatment.”

Earlier this month, the Senate unanimously passed a resolution I led with Senator MARCO RUBIO, calling on Russia to release Vladimir Kara-Murza immediately, along with Alexei Navalny, another Russian opposition leader, and thousands of others—Russians jailed for speaking up against repression, for even mentioning the possibility of the murderous war in Ukraine.

It is time for America to stand up for Mr. Kara-Murza and those like him who have shown extraordinary courage.

Senator Leila DeLima is a leading human rights advocate in the Philippines. She is a state senator who just passed her fifth year in jail.

Here she is in her cell.

Why is she in prison for 5 years? She criticized the repressive regime of President Rodrigo Duterte.

From time to time, she writes to me from her prison cell. Let me share a short excerpt of a recent letter:

Warm greetings from my detention headquarters . . . I do not know for how long I will remain behind bars but there is one thing that I am sure of—my will to fight for what is right continues to be undeterred.

Recently, two key witnesses in the sham case against Senator DeLima recanted their testimony, proving what we already know: The case against her is contrived. It is a travesty of justice.

Many Filipino Americans in Illinois tell me they are deeply concerned about the accountability and democracy and its prospects in the Philippines.

The incoming Marcos regime can demonstrate its commitment to a democratic Philippines by ending the harassment of journalists and making Senator DeLima's release one of its first priorities.

Let me now turn to Saudi Arabia—timely.

I have been troubled by the human rights record of this Kingdom, including the murder of Jamal Khashoggi, for which there is no real accountability yet.

This year brought a bit of welcome news. Writer Raif Badawi was finally freed from prison after completing a 10-year prison sentence for dubious charges about his peaceful writings.

I hope that the Saudis will allow Raif the dignity of reuniting with his brave wife, Ensaf Haidar, who I met in Washington, and their three children, now living in Canada.

Badawi's lawyer, Waleed Abu al-Khair, a leading human rights defender, is still in prison. He was convicted in Saudi Arabia's Specialized Criminal Court, usually reserved for terrorists.

I appeal to the Saudi Government to free Waleed and to allow Raif to be reunited with his family.

These gestures would be particularly notable in light of President Biden's upcoming visit.

Finally, let me turn to the United Arab Emirates.

This is Ahmed Mansoor, one of the last major human rights voices in the Emirates.

He was arrested in 2017 for using blog posts to advocate for reform and human rights in his nation. He was convicted of charges of threatening the UAE's state security and social harmony, they sentenced him to 10 years in prison. He has been there for more than 5, at times, in solitary confinement, isolated from other prisoners, no contact with his family. He has reportedly been tortured.

Despite the dismal conditions of his incarceration, he remains steadfast in his commitment to human rights. He has conducted multiple hunger strikes to protest prison conditions.

I appeal to the United Arab Emirates' new President, Muhammad bin Zayed Al-Nahyan, to take this opportunity early in his Presidency to demonstrate compassion and courage by releasing Mr. Mansoor.

America's strength around the world comes not only from our military and economic might but from the power of our values. Over the years, I have heard from many political prisoners. They tell me the support this body, of Congress, of America, and so many others in our government sustained them through the lonely, desperate times they spent in jail for days and weeks and months and years.

I will close with the words of Vladimir Kara-Murza. This is from a recent op-ed he wrote for the Washington Post from his Russian prison. He wrote:

The prisoner's worst nightmare is the thought of being forgotten . . . I always

knew how true those words were—and how important were international campaigns of solidarity with prisoners of conscience. I now feel it with my own skin.

To Vladimir Kara-Murza, Raif Badawi, Waleed Abulkhair, Senator Leila de Lima, and Ahmed Mansoor, I say: You are not forgotten, and we will continue to advocate for your freedom.

Let me also close by acknowledging that a member of my staff, Chris Homan, has really inspired me to take on this cause, and he works at it diligently—our reward, an occasional political prisoner makes it here to my office here in Washington. One of them from Africa presented me with basically a baton that he had made while in prison with my name on it because he heard that I remembered him and spoke of him on the floor of the Senate.

I would say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: Make this part of your responsibility as a U.S. Senator. Find these people, these heroes who are sadly wasting away in prison and remember them on this floor. It can make a difference. Some will be released; all will remember the fact that you stood up for them at a time of great need.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

INFLATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the latest inflation numbers came out on Friday, and it has become par for the course in the Biden economy that they weren't pretty.

Inflation hit 8.6 percent in May, the worst inflation since December of 1981. Grocery prices increased nearly 12 percent on average. Eggs were up 32 percent; chicken was up 17 percent; milk was up 15 percent; and the list goes on and on.

Gas prices were up 48 percent. Since President Biden took office, the price of gas has more than doubled. Gas is at \$5 a gallon, and the price of diesel, so essential to our Nation's farmers and ranchers, is even worse. The problem is, there is no end in sight. JPMorgan estimates that gas prices could exceed \$6 a gallon by August. Other energy costs have also increased with electricity up 12 percent and utility gas service up 30 percent.

By one estimate, inflation is costing American households \$460 per month. That is right: \$460 per month. It is no surprise that in a recent poll, 83 percent of respondents—83 percent—describe the state of the economy as "poor" or "not so good" or that just 27 percent said they have a good chance of improving their standard of living.

President Biden likes to talk about creating "an economy that works for working families." Well, I have news for the President. This economy is not working for working families. Working families can't absorb an additional \$460 a month. They have to cut back. They have to put off needed car repairs or eliminate a family vacation or cut down on milk for their kids. The Presi-

dent said the other day that "[the economy] is strong as can be but for inflation, but for gas and food."

But for gas and food? Well, I have to tell you, gas and food prices are two pretty essential economic measures for families.

Moms and dads wondering how they can afford to fill up their cars to get to work or get their kids to baseball practice don't care how good the President says the economy is when the price of a tank of gas has more than doubled since the President took office.

I guess we can at least be glad the Democrats and the President have finally started acknowledging our inflation crisis. For months last year, as inflation climbed, the administration dismissed those concerns. Even as it became more and more clear that we had a long-term problem on our hands, the President and congressional Democrats spent their time focusing not on solutions to our inflation crisis but on a massive spending spree almost guaranteed to make our inflation problem worse.

That is right. Let's remember how we got here. When President Biden took office, inflation was at 1.4 percent, well within the Fed's target inflation rate of 2 percent. And it might have stayed there had Democrats not decided to pass a massive and partisan \$1.9 trillion spending spree under the guise of COVID relief mere weeks after the Congress had passed a fifth bipartisan COVID bill that met essentially all current pressing COVID needs.

The Democrats' so-called American Rescue Plan sent a lot of unnecessary government money into the economy, and the economy overheated as a result.

And you don't have to take my word for it.

Here is what one Democratic economist who worked in the Obama administration had to say on the subject:

The \$1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan passed in the early days of the Biden administration will go down in history as an extraordinary policy mistake.

Let me just repeat that.

The \$1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan passed in the early days of the Biden administration will go down in history as an extraordinary policy mistake.

That is a direct quote from a Democratic economist who worked in the Obama administration.

Democrats were warned that the American Rescue Plan ran the risk of overstimulating the economy, but they went ahead anyway. What is almost worse was their subsequent decision to pursue another massive spending spree, their so-called Build Back Better plan, even after it had become clear that their first spending spree had helped plunge our economy into a serious inflationary crisis.

Even now—even now—as Americans deal with the worst inflation in decades, it is looking like Democrats are trying to revive elements of their Build Back Better plan and use reconciliation rules to pass yet another partisan spending spree. It is the triumph

of Big Government ideology over economic reality. If Democrats succeed in passing another partisan spending spree using reconciliation rules, Americans' economic situation is going to get even worse.

Unfortunately, there is no easy solution to the Democrats' largely self-inflicted inflation crisis, but the first priority is to do no more harm. That means no more partisan spending sprees like the Democrats' Build Back Better plan.

Another big priority should be unleashing American energy production—in particular, the domestic production of oil and gas—to ease energy prices. High gas and energy prices fuel higher consumer prices across the board—no question about it. Unleashing American energy production would not only help reduce the price of gas, but it could also help rein in prices for other commodities. Unfortunately, the President has demonstrated a clear hostility to conventional energy production, which is discouraging investment in American energy and prolonging the current gas price situation.

Another thing we should be doing to help make life easier for consumers is trying to ease supply chain woes whether that involves removing burdensome trucking regulations or passing legislation like my Ocean Shipping Reform Act.

I am pleased that both Democrats and Republicans have come together to support my bipartisan bill, which I introduced, along with Senator KLOBUCHAR, earlier this year. I am particularly grateful to my fellow South Dakotan, Representative DUSTY JOHNSON, who helped usher this legislation through the House of Representatives.

The Ocean Shipping Reform Act would help ease supply chain pressures by addressing unfair ocean carrier practices, speeding up the resolution of detention and demurrage disputes, and improving the movement of goods at our Nation's ports. It won't solve our Nation's inflation crisis, but it should help make life easier for U.S. exporters, importers, and consumers alike.

I am very pleased that this legislation passed the House of Representatives yesterday and that it will soon be on its way to the President's desk, and I hope that we will be able to pursue more bipartisan propositions to help make life easier for American families.

Democrats' big-spending, Big Government agenda has resulted in a lot of pain for working families. If President Biden and Democrats really want to make life better for ordinary Americans, they will decisively reject any further spending sprees and work with Republicans to do what we can to alleviate the inflation crisis the Democrats have helped create.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 4393

are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to complete my remarks before the Senate adjourns for the lunch hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to report that we are making serious progress in our bipartisan effort to respond to the shooting in Uvalde, TX, and other places around the country. Over the last few weeks, I have been working, in particular, with Senator MURPHY, Senator SINEMA, and Senator TILLIS on mental health and school safety reforms, and we have narrowed the scope of our discussions to provisions that we believe can earn broad bipartisan support in the Senate, and a number of our colleagues on both sides have joined the discussion.

Over the weekend, we announced an agreement on principles for bipartisan legislation, 20 Senators—10 Republicans and 10 Democrats. This included a range of targeted reforms to keep our children and our communities safe, from mental health resources to funding to harden schools and make them more safe. No parent should have to send their child to school wondering whether they are going to be safe at school, and certainly no student should be afraid to go to school for fear of their safety.

We also included a number of targeted measures to prevent violence by people committing crimes and other dangerous individuals. I am proud of the work we have done so far, but, of course, we are not at the finish line. We are still at the beginning when it comes to drafting appropriate text.

Our agreement is based on principles alone. And translating this proposal into legislative language is no easy task, as Members of the Senate understand. Here is an example of the many details that need to be ironed out: One of the big pieces of this bill relates to State crisis intervention programs and initiatives.

The idea here is pretty simple: Support programs that reduce violence, protect the public, and help individuals in crisis get the help they need. But there are a number of different ways this provision could be drafted, and I am committed to ensuring that we get it done right.

But I want to be clear because there has been a lot of misinformation, misunderstanding on this point. None of

what we are proposing would create a national red flag law—no national red flag law. Some have mischaracterized this provision as an incentive for States to pass a red flag law, but that is something I am aiming to avoid. I trust the States to make their own decisions, and 16 States have decided to pass red flag laws. But that is fewer than half of the States with red flag laws on the books. Congress should not only send Federal funding to those States but also other States that are doing things to deal with people in crisis. And as the agreement, in principle, said, what we are focused on is crisis intervention.

But there are a number of different ways that this could be approached. And I am fighting for this proposal to include a grant program that gives every State, regardless of whether it has a red flag law or not, funding to administer programs that they do have that will reduce violence, increase public safety, and make sure that individuals in crisis get the help that they need.

There should be no requirement for States that do not currently have a red flag law to pass one. The existence or lack of a red flag law should not impact on any States' ability to receive funds for crisis intervention. And if a State does want to use this money to implement a red flag law, they should not be able to do so unless their red flag law contains a full set of due process and Bill of Rights protections in the Constitution.

So how can States without red flag laws use this money? Well, there are a range of evidence-based programs that support our shared goal, which is, in fact, to keep communities safe and to save lives. One great example is the assisted outpatient treatment programs. These are sometimes just called AOTs. These programs allow courts to order people with serious mental illness to receive outpatient treatment as a condition of living in the community. AOTs can be life changing for people who struggle to maintain consistent mental health treatment.

Programs vary from State to State but typically include medication, along with a variety of other services including counseling. AOTs rely on evidence-based treatment plans to help individuals live healthier, safer lives, and they have a successful track record. Assisted outpatient treatment programs are effective in reducing arrests and incarceration, violent mental crises, and hospital stays and homelessness. I think this is another way that States without red flag laws might be able to use the funding that we would provide under the provisions of this bill. At least that is what I am hoping we ultimately will land on.

I think it would be kind of strange if we passed a national law that said only 16 States were going to be eligible for this money and you would only be eligible for it if you passed a red flag law.

I think that would almost be like trying to commandeer the States' legislature and government and force them to accept something they decided not to do but because maybe they tried to do something a little bit differently, like assisted outpatient treatment, mental health courts, which have been very successful in my State and veterans courts, in particular, to focus on our veterans community who has particular challenges.

While I am talking about assisted outpatient treatment, 47 States actually have those laws, and I would like the money that would be available under this fund for crisis intervention to be able to be used for that. Again, I don't support any prescriptive mandates or national mandates at all, including a national red flag. Each State should be able to make their own choices and use its share of funding in the best way it sees fit to protect the constitutional rights of somebody who is in mental health crisis or to provide other resources, like assisted outpatient treatment or mental health court adjudications or veterans courts hearings, in order to help them address their challenges.

The great thing about the design of our country is that we have a national government, but we have sovereign States. Louis Brandeis once called them the laboratories of democracy. And, actually, it makes plenty of sense to me that we learned from the experience of the States that have passed red flag laws and States that have passed other types of ways to address people requiring crisis intervention. This provides the ability to innovate and to try new ideas and to come up with best practices that the Federal Government simply cannot do when you are considering legislating for a country of 330 million people.

So I personally do not support an overly prescriptive grant program that favors only a few States over all 50 States. And, of course, I won't support any grant program that violates the Constitution or the requirement of due process of law when it comes to a constitutional right like the Second Amendment.

So I do believe there are a range of options to improve public safety, and the States should have the funding and flexibility to invest in programs that they think best delivers the result—to save lives, to help people in crisis. And that is really what we are trying to do with this legislation.

So the details are still being worked out. And we are drafting legislative text, and, of course, that is sometimes hard. Sometimes, I found that people use the same word, and they mean something different by it, or they come to it with a sort of context that maybe isn't apparent from a conversation about principles. And that is why going from the principles that 20 of us have agreed on into legislative text that we can then vote on and pass is a challenge.

We know that on a sensitive topic like this, a single word or the placement of a comma can make the difference between protecting and infringing on rights. So I am laser-focused on drafting text that reflects the common-sense, targeted proposal that we have agreed to in principle. Again, we are working through the details, and I hope we will have legislative text later this week. But I am not willing to rush it for the sake of speed.

I spoke with Senator SCHUMER, the majority leader, this morning, and he said he would like to have this bill ready to vote on next week. And I am certainly with him in terms of that aspirational goal. That means we are going to have to complete our work on the text by the end of this week so Senator SCHUMER will have that legislation available to take up next week.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Thank you, Senator CORNYN, for the work you are doing and working with Senator MURPHY and so many other Senators. You and I have done so many bills together, including the historic Save Our Stages bill, which made such a difference. And I am very pleased that we are finally advancing gun safety legislation. And a lot of these provisions are things that we have been working across the aisle on for many years, the boyfriend loophole—something that I introduced in 2013, 10 years ago—to close the boyfriend loophole. That is a part of this negotiation, part of the framework. We have so many women killed, 1 every 14 hours, from domestic partners—1 every 14 hours from domestic partners—with guns in this country. And, sadly, half of those involve dating partners, people who aren't married to someone, but they are in a romantic relationship with them in some way. And the way the law works in all but 19 States where it is fully closed, in many of these States, you get convicted of domestic abuse, and you can still go out and buy a gun the next day.

So I am really pleased that we are moving forward on this provision. This isn't the first time we have heard the call to action from America when it comes to guns. We heard it after 23 people were killed at a Walmart in El Paso; after 17 people were killed at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland; after 59 people were killed at a country music festival, just out there on a beautiful evening enjoying the music; after 59 people dead in Las Vegas; and after 49 people were killed at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando.

Today, we hear calls for action because of more tragedies: a White supremacist murdering 10 people who are simply shopping for groceries; one guy out buying a cake for his little boy, a birthday cake for his son, who never returned; 10 people killed.

The American people are demanding that we do something after the sense-

less murder of 19 children and 2 teachers who died putting their very lives up to protect those children in Uvalde, TX. We have seen the pictures of those kids in their confirmation-communion dresses, in their sports uniforms, the Converse green sneakers, the glasses, the smiles. In some photos, they were actually holding awards they had won just that morning.

But today, after too many of these tragedies to name, I rise with renewed hope that we are finally working together to help keep Americans safe from gun violence. While there is so much more work to be done, reforms outlined in the bipartisan framework, like encouraging States to enact risk protection orders, which are also known as red flag laws, expanding access to mental health services, and supporting school violence prevention—Senator GRASSLEY and I led that bill after Parkland that we passed with significant funding for schools. Clearly, more must be done.

As I noted, I am particularly pleased to see that the framework will include my bill to finally close the boyfriend loophole. Every year, more than 600 American women are shot to death by intimate partners. We understandably focus on the horror of these mass shootings, but think of those numbers: 600 women shot every year by intimate partners.

We know that preventing convicted domestic abusers from getting guns saves lives. We know that because we have seen the numbers in the States that have the laws in place.

Currently, Federal law only prohibits domestic abusers from buying a gun if they are currently or formerly married—think about that: currently or formerly married—or if they have ever lived together or if they have a child. That is despite the fact, as I noted, that half of these homicides—half of the women killed are killed by dating partners. That is why in 2013 I introduced this bill to close this dangerous loophole, and now, I am so pleased that there is growing bipartisan support for the bill.

By the way, we have shown that support in the past. It was part of the Violence Against Women Act that passed in the House, and it had 29 Republicans vote for it. That included an even more broad version of the bill, which also included stalking and was broader than what we are going to see in this bill.

Obviously, I support my original bill, but the fact that we are making progress to close the loophole in the States that so far have not gotten to where the other 19 are is incredibly positive. It did not pass last time when we passed the Violence Against Women Act in the Senate. Sadly, it didn't make it in there. But, again, it got 29 Republican votes in the House, and that just shows the kind of growing momentum we have for this.

I come from a State with a proud tradition of hunting and fishing, like yours. I always think about my Uncle

Dick and his deer stand, and I always ask, when I look at these proposals—from closing the boyfriend loophole to putting in better background checks, to doing something about better checking the records of 18- to 21 year olds—I think, does that hurt my Uncle Dick and his deer stand? Of course, the answer is, it does not.

This is our moment to act. It is not just one killing, and we all know that. It has happened in every single community. Every single Senator in this Chamber knows of a moment where they thought “How could this happen in my community?” when they meet with a family.

What I remember the most, actually, is a case involving a police officer out of Lake City, MN. He was a good cop doing his job. He was called to a domestic violence incident.

What people don’t often know is that for police officers, these domestic violence calls can be some of the most dangerous because you have someone who is very angry, and you don’t know what you are walking into. It is in the moment.

He gets there to the door. He has his bulletproof vest on, but the perpetrator—clearly mentally ill—who had been beating up his young, young, young girlfriend, meets him with a gun, shoots him in his head, and he dies.

I was there for that funeral. There was an outpouring of support from the community. The funeral was held in the very same church where the officer and his wife and their three little kids had gathered for the nativity play just a few weeks before for Christmas, those two little boys and a little girl. The father had sat in the front row to watch his boys in that nativity play only a few weeks before, and the next time the family is in that church, it is the widow, the two little boys, and this little tiny girl in a dress with blue stars on it walking down the aisle of that church at his funeral. That is a moment I won’t forget.

I just shows you how domestic abuse and those kinds of cases—yes, there is one immediate victim—most likely the woman—but it is a whole family who is the victim. Kids who witness domestic abuse through their lives are so much more likely to get into crime themselves. Statistics have shown it. But it is even more than the family, it is the whole community, as that family who lost their dad and lost their husband would tell you if they were standing in here right now.

So I am so pleased we are finally moving on this. I thank Senator MURPHY. I thank Senator CORNYN and all those involved. I am also so grateful that my 10 years of work leading this bill with Representative DEBBIE DINGELL in the House has not gone for naught. We kept it moving. It is probably a sign for anyone that perseverance matters in this place. I am very pleased that it is part of the final negotiations, and it will make such a difference for saving lives.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:52 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. SINEMA).

HONORING OUR PROMISE TO ADDRESS COMPREHENSIVE TOXICS ACT OF 2021—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

TRIBUTE TO TED LEHMAN

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, I come to the floor today to sadly announce the retirement—or not retirement—my chief of staff’s decision to move on to another great opportunity, and I wanted to take a few minutes to talk about Ted Lehman and not only the 5 years he has been my chief of staff but the nearly 20 years he has been working in the Senate.

Before I start, though, he attended the University of Pennsylvania, where he got his undergrad, and then he went to Georgetown to get his law degree. He clerked for Thomas Hogan, who was then the chief judge of the DC District Court.

He came to the Senate about 20 years ago, in 2002. To give you some perspective, I didn’t enter the legislature in North Carolina until 2007, so he has years of experience on me. He has knowledge of the Senate that I will never gain.

He started work with Senator Hatch. He worked for a couple of years with Senator Sessions, and then he worked for Senator GRASSLEY on the Judiciary Committee. He was the chief counsel of nominations and senior counsel for the Senate Judiciary Committee, and that is where I met Ted.

I remember vividly, when my chief of staff at the time, Ray Starling, told me that he was going to be moving back to North Carolina, I told him: Great. Now find your replacement.

It was later that day that he came to me and said: What about Ted Lehman?

I said: I think that is a fantastic idea.

Ted wasn’t looking for a job, and I wondered whether or not he would be interested in working for a freshman Senator from the State of North Carolina. But he took that job, and he has done extraordinary work, not only in terms of the day-to-day institutional grind that a chief has to go through but his attention to staff—not only the DC staff but the North Carolina staff. I think he is well-regarded among the staff, and he is going to be sorely missed.

I also need to talk about Ted and his family. To say that it is in the Lehman blood is an understatement. His brother Dirksen served on the HELP Com-

mittee with Senator Jeffords. His brother Patrick is the legislative director to Senator SASSE. He knows a lot about this institution, and he knows a lot about its processes. The first, really, opportunity I got to see that in action was when he was responsible for moving Justice Gorsuch through the nominations process.

Ted has a great family—his wife Amy, his son Jackson, his oldest son, his oldest daughter, Emma Claire, Sallye, and a young son now. Now, Ted is not from North Carolina, and we have speculated as to why he named his son what he did. He may say it is related to some sort of family tradition, but I think it is no coincidence that he named his son “Raleigh” after our State’s capitol.

Ted is an avid hunter, fisher, outdoorsman, baseball dad, soccer dad—all those sorts of things—and he gets the right balance. He understands that family is as important as work, and he figures out how to strike that balance. But there is very seldom a morning where he is not one of the first people in, and there are so many nights where I am the last person he sees before he goes home.

I appreciate his service. I am going to miss him.

Thank you, Ted.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

H.R. 3967

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise today in support of the Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring our Promises to Address Comprehensive Toxics Act, also known as the Honoring our PACT Act.

Our Nation asks a great deal of our servicemembers and their families. We ask them to be ready to fight and to win against a wide range of security challenges across the globe. Our Armed Forces know and understand the threats they may face on the battlefield. Unfortunately, servicemembers also face threats that aren’t as apparent—exposure to toxic materials. These exposures can result in rare and sometimes fatal medical conditions.

From exposure to Agent Orange to radiation from nuclear tests, veterans have carried an extra burden because of their service. It has too often been a struggle to recognize and address those impacts.

Now, a new generation is dealing with the long-term effects of toxic exposure. Indeed, during their service, up to 3½ million veterans have been exposed to toxic burn pits. As the name implies, burn pits are pits where all forms of waste, including toxic waste, are disposed of by burning. Our servicemembers lived and worked in close proximity to these burn pits, often without knowing the potential consequences to their long-term health or any way to avoid it.

Since 2009, the Department of Defense has recognized the harm burn

pits can cause. The health consequences are so serious that in the fiscal year 2022 National Defense Authorization Act, within that legislation, we included a provision that says that the only way the Department of Defense can now use a burn pit overseas is if the Secretary of Defense personally issues a waiver. It is an authority that cannot be delegated to anyone else in the Department.

The bill we have before us today would really honor our obligation to care for other veterans by acknowledging the injuries and illnesses they sustain in serving our country and providing them with treatment.

The bill would expand eligibility for VA healthcare for the 3½ million veterans who were exposed to burn pits. It would also eliminate the burden of proof for veterans for 23 conditions presumed to be caused by toxic exposure. It will create a new framework for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to evaluate the science around burn pits and establish other presumptive conditions associated with toxic exposure. It will also provide significant resources for the VA to carry out the expansion of benefits in this bill, including provisions on staffing, retention, pay, and leasing of new VA facilities.

Every generation of Americans has had men and women who were willing to serve our country in uniform. As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, I have had the honor of traveling across the globe to meet with our deployed servicemembers, including numerous trips to Afghanistan and Iraq.

Our servicemembers and our veterans truly represent what is best in our country. We honor and venerate their heroism in combat, but too often in the past, we have overlooked and dismissed the long-term health effects of their service.

This is changing.

With this bill, we will do the right thing for our toxic-exposed and combat veterans and their families. We can ensure that they have access to the care and services they deserve and have earned.

I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

Before I yield the floor, I must recognize the extraordinary work of Senator JON TESTER and Senator JERRY MORAN, the chair and ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. This was an extraordinary effort. It was bipartisan. It was motivated by the recognition on both sides of the aisle of the service and sacrifice of thousands and thousands of men and women. But we would not be here today without the undaunted and unflagging dedication of JON TESTER and JERRY. I salute both of them.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO C. CLYDE JONES

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, this afternoon, I want to recognize a longtime Manhattan, KS—known as the Little Apple—a Manhattan, KS, public servant, C. Clyde Jones, on his 100th birthday.

Before building his life in Manhattan, he grew up in West Virginia and then swore an oath to our Nation in 1943 to serve our country in the U.S. Navy during World War II.

Following his service, he returned to focus on his education, earning a bachelor's, master's, and doctorate concentrated on social science and history. After serving several universities in the South and Midwest, he received a phone call to come interview at Kansas State University. And while his initial reaction to living in the Sunflower State was less than thrilled, Kansans easily won him over when he visited. The beauty of the Flint Hills, where K-State is located, also didn't hurt. That was 60 years ago, and in that time, Clyde has left a tremendous impact both on Kansas State and the larger Manhattan community.

He was hired to head the business department within the College of Arts and Sciences; but with his leadership, it resulted in the transformation of the department into an accredited college. In 1962, he opened the Kansas State University College of Business as its first dean.

His involvement in campus life was all-encompassing, also serving as chair of the athletic council as it spearheaded the construction of the current football stadium, now known as Bill Snyder Family Stadium. It continues to welcome thousands of Wildcats to each Saturday's home game throughout the fall season.

His reach extended beyond campus as he invested in the larger community, serving on various community boards, including the United Way. He also worked as president of the Manhattan Area Chamber of Commerce. In 2001, the annual Chamber Volunteer of the Year award was renamed in his honor.

Clyde has also become a staunch advocate for Shepherd's Crossing, a local ministry focused on providing caring assistance to those in need of financial support. Over the 20 years since its founding, Clyde has held every position within the Shepherd's Crossing organization. Even today, he holds the title of chief development officer; and in this role, he has increased donations to support the work they are doing by hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Clyde's love and dedication to Manhattan has been demonstrated in everything he has done for over 60 years. Our community has been made better and stronger because of his countless hours of service.

Clyde, thank you for being an example of a solid, true, and faithful public

servant. You are what I have in mind when I say we need more civics and less politics in our community, State, and Nation. I wish you the happiest of birthdays and hope that you can ring in 100 years surrounded by the ones you love. Know that there are many of us who love you.

Happy birthday, Clyde.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3986

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, this past Saturday, I got to spend the whole morning with the East Central Kansas Model T Club back home. I even got to take a joy ride in a 1921 Model T. Among many stories, I learned Americans were paying only 21 cents a gallon when this car was made. And it wasn't until 1975, 54 years later, that gas had doubled from that price, jumping from 39 to 53 cents—54 years it took to double.

I don't have to remind anyone that, thanks to our President's energy policies and his reckless spending, he accomplished a doubling in less than 2 years. As we all know, gas is now over \$5 a gallon, if you can believe it or not. We are seeing record prices that have gone now 16 days in a row without a single downtick.

And this is why I am here today to ask for unanimous consent to pass the Gas Prices Relief Act, which would bar any Federal agency from finalizing any rule or regulation that would make it harder to produce American fuels.

My legislation would send the right signal to American producers and investors. It would show them that the Congress sees the problem and that we are ready to address it. It would set us on a course to bring down prices at the pump, not with more reckless spending and more regulations, but by getting out of the way of American production and allowing them to power the world without more needlessly restrictive rules.

With this more than doubling of price, many families back home are telling me they are paying \$50, up to \$100 a week more for gasoline. And that is \$2- to \$400 a month, in case you are adding it up. And on top of that, their monthly utility bills have doubled.

I am sure this administration will propose more reckless spending to fix that problem, too. Unfortunately, Biden-flation is impacting many Kansas families to the tune of \$6- to \$700 a month. That is over \$7,000 a year.

Now, why the increase, you might ask. Now, I am not an economist, but it looks to me like if you increase the regulations on a process, on a business, that is a surefire way to decrease the

supply. And as we all know, our President and his policies are ramping up regulations at every step of the American oil and gas business, all the while begging for help from other nations. Indeed, he is fulfilling his campaign promises to destroy American oil and gas.

Now, one more thought. As history teaches us, along with reckless spending, energy is always a leading indicator of inflation. If we don't get our arms around this energy crisis and reckless spending, we will never slow down inflation. But it appears our President and his party disagree with this, or else, simply stated, they don't care. Or maybe they want these high prices. It just seems like yesterday I was filling my truck up back home for less than \$2 a gallon, and now, again, it is over \$5 a gallon across most of the Nation.

Rising energy prices add inflationary pressure to everything. It is like a game of dominoes. When the diesel fuel powering our 18-wheelers are costing truckers 80 percent more than it did last year, they are going to have to pass on that rate to their consumers. When businesses are paying 30 percent more for their gas utilities, they are going to have to raise their prices to make up the difference. And Kansans, already paying more just to get to the store, are continually finding that what money they have left is getting them less and less every week.

You don't fix a supply-and-demand problem of this nature with price controls or artificial subsidies or more reckless spending. In reality, this is not very complicated. You could fix it by decreasing demand or increasing supply. Now, demand, unfortunately, is not decreasing, which is why we need this regulatory holiday in order to set American energy free.

On some level, the administration knows this and, hence, their knee-jerk decision to release a million barrels of oil from our Strategic Petroleum Reserve every day, reportedly without initially coordinating in a meaningful way with our partners overseas. Obviously, 1 million barrels a day won't cut it. In 2021, the United States consumed roughly nearly 20 million barrels a day. This release is truly a drop in the bucket.

The administration knows that the Strategic Petroleum Reserve releases are purely cosmetic, to try to convince the American people that they have solutions while they run off to beg foreign dictators and terrorists to produce more oil. Instead of looking within, instead of creating more Americans jobs, high-paying jobs, producing the cleanest fuel in the world, they continue their full frontal assault on American production and seek to enrich our enemies, like Venezuela and Iran.

But there has been a lot of talk on the left that they are not interfering with oil and gas production in the United States. These claims are simply untrue. On the campaign trail, Presi-

dent Biden promised to end the leasing of oil and gas production on Federal lands, and his climate czar recently said the administration "remains absolutely committed to not moving forward with additional drilling on public lands." Most Presidents brag when they fulfill a campaign promise but apparently not when the results are this bad.

It is hard to imagine that this is not all by design. This administration is getting exactly what they want. In the President's own words, the world is currently going through an "incredible transition," and he thinks we will "be stronger and the world will be stronger and less reliant on fossil fuels when this is over."

Well, the obvious question then is this: When—when will it be over? The Department of Energy has estimated that demand for oil and gas will increase through 2050. That is a simple fact. Yet we have a President who is perfectly willing to inflict pain on the people who elected him to force his climate policies—his costly climate policies—and ignore the economic reality that the American people are facing.

Now, why else would he propose a budget that gets rid of key tax provisions for the oil and gas industry? Why else would he promote policies that will make it more difficult and more expensive to drill? Does anyone think these policies are going to help the American people?

Let's talk about the stream of bad policies causing the crippling uncertainty that is making American producers hesitant to increase drilling.

Last November, the EPA started the process of updating methane regulations. While the proposed rule they put forward was criminally devoid of any details, their intent was clear: an increase in costly regulations that will harm the oil and national gas industry, run small businesses out of business, and further increase energy costs.

On February 18, by a completely partisan vote, FERC issued and made immediately effective two new policy statements that would have had disastrous implications for pipeline development in the U.S., pipelines critical to getting that oil to American consumers. Their off-the-deep-end proposal would have potentially put pipeline operators on the hook for mitigating the emissions of the end user of the product they transport. In other words, to get approval to build a pipeline, operators could have been forced to develop and pay for a way to mitigate the emissions caused by Americans driving to work every day or perhaps by Americans heating their homes or cooking their breakfast. Thankfully, in the face of fierce outcry from opponents on both sides of the aisle, they have temporarily pulled these changes back for further consideration. Though, that likely has more to do with the upcoming nomination process—the renomination process—for FERC Chairman Glick than it does with good energy policy.

On March 21, the SEC followed suit and proposed a rule that would require companies to disclose climate emission data, including greenhouse emissions, caused by their suppliers and their customers. This would require companies to calculate and disclose the emissions for how everyday Americans use their products, all in an effort to make doing business with American oil and gas producers seem even more risky and less deserving of financing.

And, finally, an issue that is at the top of mind of many producers in Kansas right now, the Fish and Wildlife Service is poised to list the lesser prairie-chicken as a threatened species. This is despite the incredible work being done by conservationists that have made the lesser prairie-chicken better protected now than ever. If the Fish and Wildlife Service goes through with this classification, it would have serious consequences for oil and gas producers in Kansas and severely limit their ability to increase production, not to mention the impact it will have on our utilities.

Once again, let me state, these reasons and more are why I am here today to ask unanimous consent to pass the Gas Prices Relief Act, which would bar any Federal agency from finalizing any rule regulation that would make it harder to produce American fuels. Our legislation would send the right signal to American producers and investors. It would show them that Congress sees the problem and that we are ready to address it. It would set us on course to bring down prices at the pump by getting out of the way and releasing American production and allowing them to power the world without more needlessly restrictive rules and regulations. Good energy policy will fix the current crisis, not more reckless spending.

Before I yield, I would like to turn the floor over to the Senator from Montana for his thoughts on the record gas prices we are facing and the need to pass our Gas Price Relief Act.

Mr. DAINES. I want to thank the Senator from Kansas for his work on this bill.

Madam President, the price at the pump has skyrocketed. Let's do a quick trip down memory lane. When President Biden was inaugurated, the weekly average price for gas was about \$2.30 a gallon. In fact, when we introduced the bill that we are trying to pass today, the Gas Price Relief Act, that was on March 31 of this year, the weekly average was \$4.02 a gallon. The weekly average today is \$4.84. In fact, other studies show it is now at \$5 and climbing. We think these numbers will keep going up. Most analysts agree. We may be facing \$6-a-gallon gas by this summer.

I filled up my pickup in Belgrade, MT, Friday night. My wife and I pulled into a gas station. And when the tank was full, the price tag was \$138.

The pain at the pump that Montana families are feeling today is because of

the Democrats' anti-American energy policies.

When President Biden killed the Keystone Pipeline 6 hours after being sworn in—by the way, that had tremendous benefits for the State of Montana. They help our impoverished Eastern Montana counties with tax revenues, not to mention providing nearly a million barrels of oil a day for the United States. By stopping and eliminating oil and gas leases, removing essential relief for small refiners, and then building an administration of, frankly, some far-left anti—anti—oil and natural gas ideologues, this administration has gone above and beyond to hinder traditional American energy development.

And what is the solution that we are hearing from President Biden? Turn to foreign dictators for more oil, tap into our oil reserves, beg OPEC to increase production, and perhaps the most out-of-touch solution I have heard, simply suggest families buy electric vehicles. I can tell you that won't work in a State like Montana.

The real solution is to unleash American energy and encourage American energy investment. This bill I have with Senator MARSHALL is simple. It prevents the Biden administration from imposing any new rules or regulations that would decrease oil, gas, or renewable fuel production, which would, therefore, increase gas prices of hard-working Montanans.

I am urging my colleagues across the aisle to think about hard-working families across this country, how are they trying to make ends meet, to think about their constituents who depend on affordable gas prices to get to work or drop kids off at school.

I am urging my colleagues across the aisle who say they support American energy development, and they want to lower gas costs, to support this bill.

We need to pass this bill for American families.

I yield back my time to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged from further consideration of S. 3986 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I have been listening with interest to my two distinguished colleagues discuss this measure, referring to it repeatedly as "governing American energy." But, of course, what it really governs is fossil fuel energy. That is the intention here, and that is the result.

Let's start with a basic factual proposition, which is that the price of oil is set by oil companies.

In a market economy, the producer of a product chooses the price. And what has happened in this instance is that the oil industry has chosen to depart from market economics, to depart from the costs that were the same just a few years ago, and instead to follow upward the international cartel that our oil industry is a part of.

This international cartel has driven world oil prices extremely high. And American oil companies have chosen—have chosen—to follow that price, raise the prices at the pump, punish American drivers, in order to blow out their profits.

We know that this is true because the companies themselves are reporting unprecedented profits—massive profits. We know they are not tracking the cost of production at a reasonable profit because their profits have soared as they have chosen—chosen—to pursue this international cartel price and punish American drivers. It is their choice.

And then they have the colossal nerve to take their choice, what they have done to American drivers, and then start using that for leverage to try to get other fossil fuel industry prerogatives accomplished politically.

And let me say, don't be mad at the gas station owner. The gas station owner is not the one who is jacking up the prices. For a lot of gas station owners, they don't even make money on the gas. You have got to go in and buy a coffee or snacks to have them make money.

Your local gas station is not the problem with these prices. The problem is Chevron, Exxon, Marathon, all of the big oil companies that have chosen to drive gas prices through the roof so they can fill their pockets with profit, so they can prepare for the fact that their product has got an end point.

We can't keep polluting the Earth the way we are with the emissions of fossil fuel. I noticed that neither of my colleagues mentioned that this fossil fuel actually gets burned. We don't eat it; we burn it. And when we burn it, it emits CO₂ and other gases, and we are seeing the effect of that all over the planet.

Pollution increases. CO₂ levels continue to increase. We constantly set new records for CO₂ levels in the atmosphere. Heat increases. We are heating the ocean so fast—there is a new term that we have, a new term of measurement, a "zettajoule." Do you know what a zettajoule is? A joule is a unit of heat energy measurement. A zettajoule is that unit with 21 zeros after it. It is an enormous number. All of the fossil fuel burned by all of the people across this entire planet amounts to less than half of a zettajoule of energy—all of it, less than half.

And for the price of that—because of the emissions, because of the pollution, because of the CO₂, because of the methane—we are heating up the planet so fast that every year 14 zettajoules of

excess heat go into the ocean, where my fishermen in Rhode Island see their catches disappear, see their lives turned upside down, see fisheries that their fathers and their grandfathers fished completely upturned.

This comes home in Rhode Island. Our Coastal Resources Management Council predicts that all that ocean warming is going to raise sea levels so that in my lifetime we are going to start to see flooding. Things that are now part of our State are going to become islands. Warwick Neck becomes Warwick Neck Island. Bristol becomes Bristol Island. Poppasquash Point becomes Poppasquash Island. Newport divides into a mainland and an island.

We become the Rhode Island archipelago. We lose enormous amounts of our shoreline to sea level rise. Never mention—never mention that harm. So when you come here and say, we want to help more fossil fuel get burned, remember that on the other end of that are places like Rhode Island.

And if we want to have a conversation about how we solve price now and how we protect against emissions later, that is a conversation I am more than willing to have. But a one-sided conversation that is only about more burning, more pollution, more emissions, more of that for Rhode Island, I don't think so.

And it is not, of course, just Rhode Island. Other States are having unprecedented wildfires. They are having unprecedented droughts. We are seeing a planet whose basic operating systems are being changed by fossil fuel emissions. And until we grapple with that seriously, you can bet I will object—which I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4217

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I would actually ask, in response, that we pass a different measure, and I would ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of S. 4217, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARSHALL. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, I think we should start calling electric cars coal-powered cars. We should start thinking about a cradle-to-grave environmental impact to some of the alternatives, but I want to reassure to my colleague, the folks on the other side of the aisle, that I want to leave this world cleaner, healthier, and safer than we found it.

But on the other hand, we can't create such high inflation with reckless

spending and energy policies that stifle American energy. I do believe that there is a balance. I do believe that there are opportunities, but we can't go from zero to 90 miles an hour overnight, nor can we throw the brakes on our current energy supply.

I grew up in the oil patch. I lived in the oil patch. The prices of oil are being driven up by the uncertainty created by this administration. Make no mistake about it, the price of oil is people who are thinking about investing, what will they get 2 years from now? It would take 2 years probably to see any type of return on investment from an oilfield exploration.

But this President and his policies, his regulations continue to create uncertainty and drive the price up for all Americans.

Just the thought of \$5-a-gallon gasoline makes my heart shiver. The people I talk to back home, there is no conversation I am going to have without someone bringing up the price of gasoline right now.

And I am so proud that we are taking traditional energies, and we are making them cleaner; that we are using biofuels to help decrease the tailpipe emissions through E15 year round and higher ethanol as well. I am proud of the biodiesel that we are using as well.

I think that there are incredible opportunities out there, but inflation, reckless spending inflation, driving up the price of gasoline very purposefully is what this President has accomplished, and it is hurting people back home.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. My colleague may care to object.

Mr. MARSHALL. So I object to Senator WHITEHOUSE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Or at least to the motion I propounded anyway.

Mr. MARSHALL. Yes, I specifically object to the motion. My apologies.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Senator WHITEHOUSE, of course, as well, but I think the intention was to object to the measure.

I see that my friend Senator BARRASSO has joined us. I had mentioned zettajoules. I want to add one other figure. This is from a report by the corporate accounting and consulting firm, Deloitte Consulting, which has said that if we don't get ahead of this climate problem that my colleague seems so scrupulously interested in ignoring, the cost to society in the next five decades will be, if I remember correctly—the number is \$178 trillion in economic harm across those years.

You want to talk about big numbers? And if we do get it right, if we grow up, treat this as a factual scientific problem and put in serious, real economic solutions, then the win side is \$43 trillion.

So the swing is \$220 trillion. You want to talk about big numbers? That is a big number. And it is going to de-

pend on decisions we make now, and I hope we start making good decisions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

ENERGY

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor as I see my colleagues debating issues related to energy, and I come to the floor to also debate and discuss the issue of energy and, specifically, the need of the American people for more energy.

Because right now, America, in terms of energy, is running on empty. Gas prices have broken records day after day after day over the last several months. Inflation increased again last month to a new record 40-year high. Just this morning, we found out that inflation from producers is even higher than inflation for consumers. Wholesale prices are up by nearly 11 percent in the last year.

That means higher prices for people who grow our food, who build our buildings, and who work so hard to keep the lights on.

Inflation for producers means inflation for consumers tomorrow. After 13 months of this inflation crisis, there is still no light at the end of the tunnel. The average price of gasoline across the United States today is over \$5 a gallon.

That is a big number. We just heard colleagues discussing big numbers. Five dollars a gallon is a big number for anyone who is driving a gas-powered car or a diesel-powered car or truck in America.

Gas prices are at an alltime high in all 50 States, and there is no end in sight. Experts tell us that the price of gas is going to continue to go higher. We may actually see \$6 a gallon this summer across the country, and today, gas is already \$6 a gallon in a number of locations.

Now, for most Americans, this is unthinkable. So what are families doing? Well, they are kind of buckling up for what may be a summer of financial suffering for the American people. For many, it means a summer of staying home. People are having to change the way they drive, the way they eat, the way they live. Family vacations are being canceled left and right. People are cutting back on shopping to the point that retail jobs disappeared last month, thousands and thousands of retail jobs.

Coronavirus caused one lockdown. Now we are headed into a new lockdown because people don't have the money to get out—get out to go to dinner, get out to go to a movie, get out to go on vacation. People are staying home because they can't afford to do anything else.

Many working families are being pushed to the breaking point. Savings have melted away. Household debt is now at a record high. More and more people are having to borrow money just to get through the end of the month. The purchasing power of the American

people keeps going lower and lower and lower. That is providing very little relief—even for people who are getting raises, they are having a hard time keeping up and feel they are falling further behind.

Home energy costs are up and will continue to go up this summer. We hear that our energy grid is vulnerable for blackouts this summer. Democrats have been in power for over 17 months. They continue to do nothing to help the American people with this Biden-caused energy crisis.

Now, Joe Biden's Cabinet has been on tour, talking and trying to mislead the American people about the energy crisis. We saw Pete Buttigieg and Gina Raimondo. They said that Joe Biden is just an innocent bystander, just standing there, watching the world go by. Nothing he could do about it.

The Commerce Secretary last week said—and this was on a national news show—she said there isn't much that can be done to produce more energy. Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen said Joe Biden has “done everything he can to bring down energy prices.” Everything he can? This is a blatant, bold-faced lie to the American people.

Joe Biden and the Democrats have caused this American energy crisis. Joe Biden seemed to brag about it at first when, on his first day in office, he killed the Keystone XL Pipeline, killing 800,000 barrels of oil a day to the United States—more than we would have ever gotten from Putin. Joe Biden bragged about it, proud of himself. Stopped those oil and gas leases as well. What the President has done with the oil and gas leases was blatantly illegal and brutally punished working families in my home State of Wyoming.

You know, after 16 months in office, President Obama had held 44 oil and gas lease sales. Joe Biden? Not a single one.

If the Senator from Alaska were here, she would say that Joe Biden shut down oil and gas production in the Arctic. For leases that were out there, drilling applications, thousands and thousands are in limbo because the administration just wants them to sit there.

Now Joe Biden is furthering his attack on American energy. He is not just blocking new leases, he is even going after thousands of existing leases that were sold during previous administrations, the Obama and the Trump administrations.

After just 16 months in office—and the American people know this; I am not making any news here—Joe Biden is already the most anti-American energy President in American history. He has kept our energy production on lockdown, he has kept workers on the sideline, and he has kept energy buried in the ground. As a result, today, we are still producing 1 million fewer barrels of oil today and every single day than we were producing in America before the pandemic.

So, despite what the administration claims, Joe Biden could do things right now to actually produce more energy. First, instead of blocking all Federal land, he needs to hold Federal oil and gas lease sales. He should approve the 4,300 drilling applications that he is holding in limbo. Finally, instead of shutting down pipelines, he should approve more pipelines so we can transmit energy. He should speed up the pipeline approval process. Right now, it takes a lot longer to get approval to build a pipeline than it does to actually build a pipeline. But Joe Biden refuses to change his policies. That is why I say that Joe Biden actually wants high gas prices.

Democrats keep bragging about the so-called incredible transition. It is a transition that is strangling the American people. Joe Biden went on a late-night comedy show last week. He was asked about climate change. He said right now "there's an opportunity to move more rapidly . . . to alternative energy." He seems to think everything is going according to plan.

The climate elitists want prices so high that people can't afford to buy gas. The economists call this demand destruction. Democrats are working to achieve demand destruction through supply destruction, and the result is economic destruction—a destruction of the standard of living for the American people—all because they want their climate ideology.

So Democrats have kept supply slow and low. They have driven up prices. Now the American people are forced to stay home.

Well, the Transportation Secretary continues to say: Just get an electric vehicle. Gas prices are no big deal.

The average electric vehicle costs over \$55,000. The American people can barely afford groceries right now, let alone an electric vehicle. CNN ran a story recently about single mothers skipping meals so their kids can eat. I would say to the Secretary of Transportation: How are they going to afford the electric vehicle, let alone find a place to charge it?

Astonishing stories have been written in the press recently. People trying to drive electric vehicles from point A to point B said: Never again. Oh, no.

I have heard stories of someone renting an electric vehicle in Wyoming, driving it from one place to another, using a regular plug-in, coming back an hour later, and it had charged the battery enough extra in that full hour that they could go an additional 4 miles. That is what Joe Biden wants for America. That is his view of America—"stay at home" Joe.

The Transportation Secretary refuses to admit that gas prices drive up the cost of other things like food, the cost of retail, the cost of almost everything.

Democrats tell us that we just need a little more wind energy, a little more solar power, and things would be great. So what is Joe Biden doing? He listens to them, and he uses wartime Execu-

tive powers to demand that we make more solar panels.

This is another dangerous Democrat delusion. We don't have high gas prices and high food prices because of a lack of solar panels; we have high gas prices and high food prices because of a lack of American gasoline, oil, energy.

Democrats keep repeating the talking points about renewable energy. Yet they never do the math. The most affordable and most reliable energy known to man is traditional energy—oil, natural gas, coal. Electric vehicles still use energy. This energy comes mostly, in this country, from natural gas and coal.

The only way to bring the price of gas down is to bring the supply of gas up. It is the one thing the Democrats refuse to do.

It is interesting to listen to some of Joe Biden's allies in the Senate who are threatening to make the Biden energy crisis even worse. They want to talk about bringing back their reckless tax-and-spending bill. This bill is more reckless today than it was last year. You put that kind of additional spending on the economy, that kind of additional debt—inflation today is a lot higher than it was the last time they forced this kind of money onto the economy. This will be adding fuel to the fire.

Then the Democrats are talking about raising taxes and specifically raising taxes on American energy. More taxes on American energy means higher prices at the pump. It is as simple as that. Higher prices at the pump means higher prices at the grocery store. Now isn't the time to raise taxes on the American people.

Janet Yellen was surprised. She said it last week. She talked to the New York Times. She said she was surprised at how negative people's opinion was of the economy. She said she was amazed at how pessimistic people were about the economy. How out of touch can one be for the Secretary of Treasury to say that at a time when there are the highest gas prices in the history of the country, food prices at an alltime high, and inflation at a 40-year high?

Over three out of four Americans think the country is heading in the wrong direction under Joe Biden and the Democrats. The American people have seen what 16 months of Democrat rule has done to them, and Janet Yellen is surprised at the pessimism and the negativity.

Record inflation, record gas prices, record debt, disappearing savings, empty shelves, labor shortages, a looming recession—it is long past time to change course. It is time to stop this reckless spending, unleash American energy. The American public cannot afford to pay the price, but they will make the Democrats pay the price come November.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(Mr. MURPHY assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. DURBIN assumed the Chair.)

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CELEBRATING THE 245TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CREATION OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, this is one of the more enjoyable things of being a Senator, especially when I have some friends in from Southern Indiana up in the Gallery to see what we do here.

I rise today to offer a resolution expressing support for the Pledge of Allegiance as an expression of patriotism and honoring the 245th anniversary of the introduction of our United States flag.

Today we celebrate Flag Day, which was first established over 100 years ago by President Woodrow Wilson. As we pause to recognize all that our flag represents, let us also honor those who have sacrificed everything to defend it.

In 2002, Senator Tom Daschle raised a similar resolution with unanimous support from the Senate. It passed on the floor uneventfully. Today, I ask this body to reaffirm our support for the Pledge of Allegiance.

I also rise to honor a fellow Hoosier who knew the innate value of the Pledge of Allegiance to civic education. In 1969, Red Skelton, the American entertainer who was well-known for the program "The Red Skelton Hour," wrote a speech on the importance of the pledge. Reflecting on his time in Vincennes, IN, he spoke about the values instilled by one of his high school teachers.

After the performance of the speech, CBS received 200,000 requests for copies. The speech would go on to be sold as a single by Columbia Records and performed at the White House for President Nixon. I think it would honor Mr. Skelton's memory and the importance of the Pledge of Allegiance if it were recited today on the Senate floor in the words of Mr. Red Skelton. I have done this 2 prior years too. This should never get old for anyone here or the American public in general.

When I was a small boy in Vincennes, [Indiana.] I heard, I think, one of the most outstanding speeches I ever heard in my life. I think it compares with the Sermon on the Mount, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, and Socrates' Speech to the Students.

We had just finished reciting the Pledge of Allegiance, and he [Mr. Lasswell, the Principal of Vincennes High School] called us all together, and he says, "Uh, boys and girls, I have been listening to you recite the Pledge of Allegiance all semester, and it seems that it has become monotonous to you. Or, could it be, you do not understand the meaning of

each word? If I may, I would like to recite the pledge, and give you a definition of each word:

I—Me, an individual; a committee of one.

Pledge—Dedicate all of my worldly good to give without self-pity.

Allegiance—My love and my devotion.

To the Flag—Our standard. “Old Glory”; a symbol of courage. And wherever she waves, there is respect, because your loyalty has given her a dignity that shouts “Freedom is everybody’s job.”

Of the United—That means we have all come together.

States—Individual communities that have united into 48 great states

Remember the time when they didn’t.

Forty-eight individual communities with pride and dignity and purpose; all divided by imaginary boundaries, yet united to a common cause, and that’s love of country—

Of America.

And to the Republic—a Republic: A sovereign state in which power is invested into the representatives chosen by the people to govern; [us] and the government is the people; and it’s from the people to the leaders, not from the leaders to the people.

For which it Stands.

One Nation—Meaning “so blessed by God.”

[Under God]

Indivisible—Incapable of being divided.

With Liberty—Which is freedom; the right of power for one to live his own life without fears, threats, or any sort of retaliation.

And Justice—The principle and qualities of dealing fairly with others.

For All—For All. That means, boys and girls, it’s as much your country as it is mine.

Afterward, Mr. Lasswell asked the students to recite the Pledge of Allegiance together, with newfound appreciation for the words.

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic, for which it stands; one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Mr. Skelton concluded his speech by saying:

Since I was a small boy, two states have been added to our country, and two words have been added to the Pledge of Allegiance: “Under God.” Wouldn’t it be a pity if someone said, “That is a prayer”—and that it be eliminated from our schools, too?

Just as those students that day, Mr. Red Skelton included, recommitted to the meaning of the words of the Pledge of Allegiance, I call upon the U.S. Senate to recommit to these words as well.

There are times today that the words of the Pledge of Allegiance are tossed around without care. Other times, they are altered to remove what today is deemed offensive or antiquated. But Americans should not misuse or abuse our Pledge of Allegiance. The Pledge of Allegiance is meant to remind Americans of our guiding principles and inspire adherence to those ideas which make our country great: equality under the law, recognized rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This is why today, on National Flag Day, I am requesting unanimous consent from my colleagues that my resolution expressing support for the Pledge of Allegiance is passed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the

consideration of S. Res. 671, submitted earlier today; further, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 671) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

Mr. BRAUN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 3967

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, as we know, the Senate is currently considering the Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring our PACT Act. This bipartisan legislation is the most comprehensive toxic exposure bill ever considered for veterans.

Passing toxic exposure legislation has been a priority for Senator TESTER, the chairman of the committee, and for me, the ranking member, and we wanted to do it this Congress, and we are close to accomplishing that.

Last Congress, we were able to deliver landmark mental health legislation for veterans, and this Congress, we were committed to passing long-lasting solutions that will reform the VA’s process by which veterans who were exposed to burn pits and Agent Orange receive their benefits and healthcare.

About a month ago, Senator TESTER and I announced a bipartisan agreement and introduced the historic Heath Robinson PACT Act. Part of the agreement between the chairman and me was that two amendments would be considered for this legislation.

I offered an amendment to strike the creation of a fund which would classify over \$116 billion in discretionary costs associated with the bill as entitlement spending. I believe that this untested and unique way of classifying spending lessens congressional oversight at a time of massive debt and deficits, and it sets a bad precedent.

Senator LEE has an amendment requiring the Secretary to use science when evaluating presumptions established in the bill. That amendment has been filed.

Senator ERNST has an amendment requiring the Secretary to certify that with the resources and authorities provided through this bill, there won’t be a negative consequence for veterans in the system.

There are at least three amendments proposing to offset the cost of the bill or at least a portion thereof with spending reductions elsewhere.

I am hopeful that in the days ahead, before final passage of this bill, we will let our colleagues be heard through an amendment process, pass or fail.

I have also hoped that the two amendments that I expected to be able to offer would be made in order. That hasn’t been the case to date, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be made in order for the following amendments to be made pending to the substitute amendment No. 5051 by their sponsors or their designees: One, the Ernst amendment, Secretary of VA certification, No. 5072; two, the Lee amendment to modify the authority to create presumptions, No. 5048; the Johnson amendment to pay for COVID money, amendment No. 5055; the Paul amendment, to pay for this legislation from USAID, No. 5060; the Blackburn community care amendment, No. 5075; my amendment, the community care amendment, No. 5064; my amendment to strike section 805, No. 5063; the Marshall amendment on collective bargaining, No. 5071; the Murkowski amendment on appraisals for housing loans, No. 5069; and the Inhofe amendment concerning Camp Lejeune, No. 5094. I further ask that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate vote in relation to these amendments in the order listed; further, that upon disposition of the amendments listed, all postcloture time on the substitute amendment No. 5051 be expired and the remaining pending amendments be withdrawn, with the exception of the substitute amendment No. 5051, as amended, if amended, and that the Senate vote on adoption of the substitute amendment, as amended, if amended; and finally, that upon disposition of amendment No. 5051, as amended, if amended, the cloture motion with respect to the underlying bill, H.R. 3967, be withdrawn, the bill, as amended, if amended, be read a third time, and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended, with 60 affirmative votes required for passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Reserving the right to object, we are here on the cusp of doing something that really tells the fighting men and women who serve in our military all around the world that we have got your back.

We are here because of what I would say is a great working relationship between the ranking member, Senator MORAN, and myself. As I said in the VA Committee earlier, that relationship is going to continue regardless, and the reason is because, in this place, there is something that is missing, and it is called trust. And I trust Senator MORAN. We have been through this for the last year and a half and even longer.

When you were chairman of the committee, many of the bills that are in this package, you oversaw their passage out of committee.

But because negotiations continue and because I still believe, even though this process is very broken—we both know that—I still believe that we are going to be able to come to something that both of us can agree on with amendments through our leadership—by the way, we would agree on something anyway—but through our leadership. That is why I am objecting to your motion.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I would conclude by encouraging the chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs to use his substantial level of influence with the leaders that he described as necessary to approve the consideration of these amendments.

He speaks of the word "trust," and I have great trust in his ability to accomplish the desired outcome that I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, may I ask the ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Through the Presiding Officer, you are allowed to do that.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, are you asking me to throw my weight around?

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry of the Senator from Montana through the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, you may.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, if I answered the question, Mr. Chairman, would that be considered derogatory?

Perhaps it is a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I think in Montana, it is considered a compliment.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here for the 15th time in my series of "Scheme" speeches to call attention to the rightwing donors' long-planned scheme to capture and control our Supreme Court.

What I will talk about today is that scheme's donor-funded doctrine factory and a case in which the "Court that dark money built" could weaponize dangerous, concocted doctrines to power up polluters and threaten the basic function of government.

Before I get into this, let me say that I detest and condemn violence or threatened violence against members of the Court, and I object even to protesters making a racket in Justices' neighborhoods. There is a lot to be angry about, but the solution is through democracy and laws, not violence and noise. The capture of the Court by secret and special interests is deadly serious under our laws, and we have to respond seriously under our laws. Neighborhood noise and violent threats don't help.

Let's remember that all three Trump Supreme Court Justices were actually chosen and then campaigned for by a dark money donor apparatus. Remember, the whole point of the scheme is to capture the Court so it will deliver big wins for the big rightwing donors, no matter how unpopular or radical those wins are. Remember that the donor elite behind the scheme spent hundreds of millions of dollars on an apparatus to capture the courts. It plotted for decades to seize this power and set up a system to get its hand-picked, extremist nominees onto the Bench. It instructs those Justices with coordinated flotillas of amicus briefs so the Justices know how they are supposed to rule. It is quite an operation.

But none of that works—none of that works if judges are following the law as it is. Existing legal precedents are a problem for the scheme. So, to accomplish its mission, a radical deconstruction of our American laws, the big donor elite need to destroy decades of legal precedent.

We got a preview in the looming effort, shown by the Alito leaked draft opinion, to destroy precedent protecting women's right to decide about abortion and relocate that right from women to State legislatures. That is just the scheme's opening act, a sop to one segment of its social issues base. The scheme is out to deconstruct American law and destroy established precedent across many areas of the law.

Now, if you are out to deconstruct American law and replace it with what the big donors want, you need some intellectual weaponry. You don't just need Justices who will do what you ask, you need legal theories. You need to give the Justices you put on the Court the intellectual artillery—the demolition theories—that will help them destroy the precedents and deconstruct our legal system.

So that is a problem.

But when you are spending more than half a billion dollars on such a scheme, you can find solutions. And sure enough, rightwing donor interests found solutions. It took time, but the whole scheme took time. It took a lot of money, but the whole scheme took a lot of money. It took patience and planning, but what a payoff when you succeed.

And now it is payday.

The first thing you do is erect an array of legal think tanks, phony insti-

tutes, the hothouses in which the deconstruction theories are grown; the factories, if you will, where doctrines are crafted, reverse-engineered from the results the big donors want so that willing, complicit Justices have the ideological weaponry for deconstruction of the law.

These think tanks do a couple of things. First, they nurture rightwing legal scholars to formulate bogus legal doctrines. They pay them comfortable salaries. They grant them nice titles. They cover their trips to conferences and symposia with fellow hothouse scholars. The whole thing apes regular academia, but this academia-resembling performance has a very different mission: It has deliverables.

Second, they systematically cheerlead for their new legal doctrines. They create an echo chamber of approval for their cultivated fringe ideas. Once the hothouse conjures a fringe idea, the hothouse bounces it among other so-called scholars and through other anonymously funded affiliate groups and through law school debate clubs and conservative conferences—also funded by secretive donors—and into flotillas of scripted amicus curiae briefs and ultimately, the prize, into legal opinions. They create a legitimization process, and of course they concoct or retool the desirable theories.

The legal theories are actually pretty easy to come up with. You reverse-engineer. You start with what big donor interests want and then work backward. And what lots of big donors want—especially fossil fuel companies—is to weaken and disable government regulation.

Government regulators stop all sorts of harmful corporate practices: pollution of our air, water, and climate; dangerous factory floor working conditions; crooked schemes that cheat investors; snake oil medications that don't cure disease; unsafe products; insurance policies that don't pay. The list is long. Demolishing that protective network of regulations protecting America's health, safety, and financial well-being is a scheme priority, and the destruction begins by pejoratively naming the Agencies whose work protects us the "administrative state."

There are many of these doctrine-growing hothouses. Two examples are the Cato Institute, originally founded by the Koch brothers, and the C. Boyden Gray Center for the Study of the Administrative State at George Mason University's Antonin Scalia Law School, of course. Both of these groups are funded to pump out and legitimize anti-regulatory fringe theories and talking points.

Think of them as factories for ideological artillery designed for the demolition of Federal Agencies' authority, particularly over polluters.

What do they manufacture? Well, the concocted doctrines fall into a few buckets. There is the so-called unitary executive theory, cooked up to argue

that safeguards set in place by Congress to protect Federal Agencies against political interference are unconstitutional.

Now, if you are a big donor and you paid big bucks to get your man in the White House, you want political interference by your guy in regulatory decisions.

Congress built safeguards against that for a very good reason. But a captured Court could disable Congress's ability to defend the Agencies that Congress itself created. This unitary executive legal theory was the pet theory of the Reagan administration. It was thoroughly debunked by serious scholars and rejected initially even by the Supreme Court. But the rightwing Court-capture apparatus has persistently kept this theory a Federalist Society cornerstone and diligently packed the Court with new Justices more amenable to this nonsense.

Other concocted doctrines also target Agencies. The so-called nondelegation doctrine is so radical and meritless that the Supreme Court dismissed it a century ago, except for rare cases that no longer exist where Congress might give Agencies power with no direction whatsoever.

This nondelegation idea has been retooled in the doctrine factories to target Agency regulation generally. Under this doctrine as retooled, the power is removed from Congress and given to unelected courts to decide how questions should be assigned by Congress to Federal Agencies. This gives big, regulated industries a big weapon to attack the Federal Government's ability to regulate problems that they cause, at a minimum allowing industries to tie public protection regulations up in years, even decades, of litigation.

Federalist Society Justices on the Court long clamored for the nondelegation doctrine, and as new Federalist Society Justices get added to the Court, it becomes more probable. Certainly the dark money front groups that provide instruction and encouragement to the Federalist Society Justices—they are in full clamor, using amicus curiae briefs to signal their wishes to the captured Court.

On now to yet another hothouse-grown doctrine, the major questions doctrine, which provides a similar weapons platform to assault public safety regulations. Where the nondelegation doctrine would require Congress to set more specific regulatory standards for Agencies to police, the major questions doctrine would let the unelected Court determine that some questions are just too big to regulate—too big to regulate at all.

Again, at a minimum, that lets big industries snarl Agency protections up in litigation. At worst, it forces Congress into detailed, complex questions that Congress already determined—already determined—should better be handled by expert Agencies.

Perhaps I should mention here how hard the Federalist Society Justices

have worked to create avenues of corporate political influence, including anonymous, unlimited, corporate political spending, allowing corporate interests to blockade action in Congress; but while it is relevant here, that is a longer story for another day.

All of these concocted doctrines share the premise that Congress may not deploy Agency regulation against certain problems and that the power to grant Agencies authority to regulate in certain areas is, instead, to be decided by unelected courts—in present circumstances, decided by a captured Supreme Court with Members installed by big special interest money.

What could possibly go wrong?

All of these concocted doctrines overlook the robust oversight of Federal Agencies by the people's Representatives in Congress and by courts, tasked by Congress, with applying the Administrative Procedure Act. If an Agency were to go rogue, Congress can immediately intervene. Congress can reverse the decision of the Agency. Congress can change the underlying law the Agency enforces. Congress can redirect, defund, or even eliminate the errant Agency. Moreover, if Agencies don't follow the law as Congress directed or if the Agencies behave illogically or unfairly or don't give evidence proper consideration, there are avenues of legal relief in court.

But the donors behind the scheme don't want relief from improper or misguided Agency action. They want relief from lawful, legitimate, and correct Agency action. This is a power grab by regulated interests using the Court, and they can do it because of the scheme. It is not a bug that these doctrines threaten harm to an array of basic government functions; it is their purpose.

Let's go back to what the rightwing, corporate-funded propaganda machine likes to deride as the "administrative state"—their little code word. What has really gone on in these Agencies? I will tell you what has gone on.

Over nonstop quarreling by big special interests, regulatory Agencies made life better. They made drinking water safer. They cleaned up smokestacks. They put airbags in cars and required better seatbelts. They protected us from contaminated food. They made medication safer and more effective—no more snake oil mysteries. They made financial markets safer places for retirement funds and college savings plans to grow. They made it harder for stockjobbers to sucker innocent investors. They required insurance policies to actually pay when an insured risk occurs. They put an end to people dying from disasters like boiler explosions that used to be a regular thing. Americans live longer; highways are no longer carnage; products are safer; markets are stronger; and the American economy is more robust. So, whenever you hear the phrase "administrative state," it should ring in your head a little alarm bell that special in-

terest mischief is afoot, which brings me to the ruling expected from the Supreme Court in a case called *West Virginia v. EPA*.

The fossil fuel interests behind the case are challenging the Federal Government's power to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from existing coal-fired power plants. Put simply, they want to make it harder to fight climate change. I can't think of a more important protection for the American people than a livable planet, and I can't think of a Member of Congress who has done more work to achieve those protections than the Presiding Officer, but the fossil fuel industry is desperate to continue to pollute for free.

The first thing to know about this case is that there is no case. The Constitution requires "a case or controversy"—that is the language in the Constitution: "a case or controversy" before the Court can intervene—and, here, there is no case because there is no Agency rule to challenge. The Trump administration's rule, which was a sop to polluters, was thrown out—gone. The Obama-era rule is not being pursued—gone. Biden's EPA has announced that it is formulating a new, different rule that it has not yet produced. It is not out. There is no rule in place right now.

That does not seem to bother the scheme's new donor-selected majority. A few Republican States, bolstered and probably directed by an armada of rightwing, dark-money front groups, sued to challenge the EPA's authority, and the captured Court jumped right in.

Think about that for a moment.

With no actual rule to review, the Court is, apparently, going to decide this case based on what the Biden administration might do or issue some general observations about the EPA. Where I come from, there is a name for that. It is called an advisory opinion, and our Supreme Court is forbidden to do that under our Constitution.

This is actually a big deal at the heart of the separation of powers, but the Federalist Society Justices, packed onto the Court with fossil fuel dark money, are on a mission to deconstruct the administrative state. So why let the Constitution get in the way? Just throw out more precedent about case or controversy. What is one more smashed precedent in the captured Court's cascade of precedent demolition? The donors don't care. They are not finicky. They want results.

Fossil fuel is the political 800-pound gorilla in this country. The industry spent decades blocking climate action in Congress. It lurked behind this web of climate denial front groups that sowed false doubt about climate science. It was their job to mischaracterize the science. It is behind what watchdog group Influence Map calls the biggest climate-obstructing trade organization in Washington—the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Boom.

It maintains its own trade group hitmen, like the American Petroleum Institute. It funnels secret money by the tens of millions into Republican super-PACs and other secret, partisan political spending fronts in a not-so-hostile takeover of the Republican Party, and it wrote some of the biggest checks to pay for the scheme, funneled through dark-money conduits like DonorsTrust and the Judicial Crisis Network.

When I say we now have the Court that dark money built, it is probably more accurate to say that we now have the Court that dark fossil fuel money built. So watch out for the six-Justice supermajority that is poised to rule in this no case “case.”

It is no surprise that the amici—the amicus curiae, the so-called friends of the Court—gathered in this case read like a who’s who of fossil fuel polluter front groups. The Competitive Enterprise Institute, for instance, produces hothouse attacks on the EPA’s authority, and is funded by ExxonMobil, Murray Energy, the American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers, the American Petroleum Institute, and the Koch brothers’ political groups. Fossil fuel front groups, as amici and litigants, sing a harmonious chorus of “unitary executive” and “nondelegation” and “major question”—all concocted doctrines targeting the administrative state they so resent.

Back before the takeover, here is what the Court said in a case called *Mistretta*.

The Court said this:

In our increasingly complex society, replete with ever changing and more technical problems, Congress simply cannot do its job absent an ability to delegate power under broad general directives.

That is the language of the Court:

In our increasingly complex society, replete with ever changing and more technical problems, Congress simply cannot do its job absent an ability to delegate power under broad general directives.

That is the precedent of the Court. That is the law of the land, and it is the law that special interests sent these Justices to the Court to deconstruct. So get ready.

To be continued.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING JULIE BECKETT

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the incredible life and legacy of Julie Beckett, a champion for individuals who experience disabilities and for their families.

In 1978, Julie’s daughter Katie was born, and 4 months later, Katie con-

tracted a brain infection that left her paralyzed and on a ventilator. After 2 years of living in a hospital, Katie’s family had reached the limit on their health insurance policy and applied for support through Medicaid but were told that Medicaid would not cover at-home care.

Julie and her husband, Mark, knew they did not want their daughter growing up in a hospital, especially when she could receive the care that she needed at home while also being with her loved ones.

Faced with uncertainty and with Federal officials who would not make an exception, Julie reached out to her Congressman. Julie noted that making this exception for her daughter would not only be good for her family but also that keeping her at home rather than at a hospital would cost the government far less money.

Julie’s advocacy worked. Because she made the choice to speak up and share her story, Congress passed and President Reagan signed into law an exception to Medicaid rules that enabled Julie’s family and many others to care for their loved ones at home.

Julie’s work has had a profound impact on not just her own family but countless others, including my own. My son Ben experiences severe physical disabilities, and because of Julie’s advocacy, he could grow up at home and with family. And because he was able to live at home, Ben had the opportunity to go to school, to learn, and make friends in our community.

The terrible reality is that before Julie, many children grew up in hospitals or in institutionalized care, instead of surrounded by the love and care of their families, siblings, and neighbors.

But my family’s story is not unique. In the decades since, what is now known as the Katie Beckett waiver has changed hundreds of thousands of lives. More than half a million children have received these waivers and have been able to live, grow, and thrive at home.

Julie’s story is an example of how one person can make a true difference in our democracy. And even after her successful work in securing this significant exception for Medicaid, Julie kept fighting for children who experienced disabilities. She helped lead a charge to expand coverage and fought against attempts to repeal the Affordable Care Act. And critically, she worked with families throughout the country to show them how they could be advocates as well.

Julie passed away last month, but her legacy will live on in the lives that she has changed and the advocacy that she helped to inspire. I am profoundly grateful for her work, and I join with people across the country in committing to carrying on her legacy of fighting to fully include people with disabilities in every facet of American life.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Republican leader, and notwithstanding rule XXII, it be in order for Senator PAUL or his designee to make a motion to proceed to Calendar No. 397, S. Con. Res. 41 on Wednesday, June 15, 2022; further, if the motion to proceed is agreed to, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 388, H.R. 3967, postcloture, and that upon disposition of the Calendar No. 388, H.R. 3967, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 397, S. Con. Res. 41.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 925, Alan M. Leventhal, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Denmark; that there be 10 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form on the nomination; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action; and that the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATE ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT VENUE ACT OF 2021

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 261, S. 1787.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1787) to amend title 28 of the United States Code to prevent the transfer of actions arising under the antitrust laws in which a State is a complainant.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Lee amendment which is at the desk be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 5096) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the retroactive effective date)

Strike section 3.

The bill (S. 1787), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 1787

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “State Anti-trust Enforcement Venue Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS.

Section 1407 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended—

- (1) in subsection (g) by inserting “or a State” after “United States”, and
- (2) by striking subsection (h).

AIR AMERICA ACT OF 2021

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 370, S. 407.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 407) to provide redress to the employees of Air America.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Air America Act of 2022”.

SEC. 2. AIR AMERICA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Air America, Incorporated (referred to in this section as “Air America”) and its related cover corporate entities were wholly owned and controlled by the United States Government and directed and managed by the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Central Intelligence Agency from 1950 to 1976.

(2) Air America, a corporation owned by the Government of the United States, constituted a “Government corporation”, as defined in section 103 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) The service and sacrifice of the employees of Air America included—

(A) suffering a high rate of casualties in the course of employment;

(B) saving thousands of lives in search and rescue missions for downed United States airmen and allied refugee evacuations; and

(C) lengthy periods of service in challenging circumstances abroad.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “affiliated company”, with respect to Air America, includes Air Asia Company Limited, CAT Incorporated, Civil Air Transport Company Limited, and the Pacific Division of Southern Air Transport;

(2) the term “qualifying service” means service that—

(A) was performed by a United States citizen as an employee of Air America or an affiliated company during the period beginning on January 1, 1950, and ending on December 31, 1976; and

(B) is documented in the attorney-certified corporate records of Air America or any affiliated company;

(3) the term “survivor”, with respect to an individual who performed qualifying service, means—

(A) a widow or widower of the individual who performed qualifying service; or

(B) an individual who, at any time during or since the period of qualifying service, was a dependent or child of the individual who performed qualifying service; and

(4) the terms “widow”, “widower”, “dependent”, and “child” have the meanings given those terms in section 8341(a) of title 5, United States Code, except that that section shall be applied by substituting “individual who performed qualifying service” for “employee or Member”.

(c) CREDITABLE SERVICE.—Any period of qualifying service shall be treated as creditable service for purposes of subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) RIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An individual who performed qualifying service or a survivor of such an individual—

(A) shall be entitled to the rights, retroactive as applicable, provided to employees and their survivors for creditable service under the Civil Service Retirement System under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, with respect to that qualifying service; and

(B) may submit an application for benefits based on the qualifying service to the Office of Personnel Management not later than 2 years after the effective date under section 2(g) of this Act.

(2) INDIVIDUALS DECEASED BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—A survivor of an individual who performed qualifying service and became eligible, by reason of this Act, for benefits based on the qualifying service under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code (but became deceased before the date of enactment of this Act)—

(A) may submit an application for benefits based on the qualifying service to the Office of Personnel Management not later than 2 years after the effective date under section 2(g) of this Act, disregarding any requirement that an employee have filed an application while living; and

(B) upon submission of the application under subparagraph (A), shall be eligible for a survivor annuity under section 8341 of title 5, United States Code, equal to 55 percent (or 50 percent if the deceased individual retired before October 11, 1962) of the self-only annuity (as defined in section 838.103 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation)) that otherwise would have been paid to the deceased individual.

(e) DEDUCTION, CONTRIBUTION, AND DEPOSIT REQUIREMENTS.—The deposit of funds in the Treasury of the United States made by Air America in the form of a lump-sum payment apportioned in part to the Civil Service Disability and Retirement Fund in 1976 is deemed to satisfy the deduction, contribution, and deposit requirements under section 8334 of title 5, United States Code, with respect to all periods of qualifying service.

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to set any type of precedent for purposes of civil service retirement credit with the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund or any successor fund.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect on the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 407), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 2022 AS STROKE AWARENESS MONTH

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 672, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 672) expressing support for the designation of May 2022 as “Stroke Awareness Month”.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. HASSAN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 672) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION TO PREPARE A REVISED EDITION OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 673, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 673) authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to prepare a revised edition of the Standing Rules of the Senate as a Senate document.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. HASSAN. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 673) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

MORNING BUSINESS

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING NELSON W. MILNER, SR., AND CLARENCE R. MILNER, SR.

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I rise today with a heavy heart to pay tribute to Nelson W. Milner, Sr., and Clarence R. Milner, Sr. Both men were beloved relatives of former Hartford, CT, mayor Thirman L. Milner, the first elected African-American mayor in New England. They passed away earlier this year and leave extraordinary legacies of thoughtful, compassionate work.

Nelson was born in Hartford, CT, and was the brother of former Mayor Milner. Upon graduating from high school, he joined the Air Force, serving for 3 years. Stationed in Riverside, CA, Nelson remained in the State with his late wife, Arthurrine, following his service. In the 1980s, Nelson returned to Hartford in support of his brother's mayoral campaign.

Passionate about serving others, Nelson became an ordained deacon and taught Sunday school. He also played the keyboard with the East Hartford senior center band. Nelson focused his final years on strengthening his relationship with his family, including his 10 children, 5 stepchildren, and many grandchildren and great-grandchildren. He passed away on February 15, 2022, at the age of 90.

Nelson and Arthurrine's son, Clarence, was born in California. He would go on to have 10 children of his own, as well as 4 stepchildren, 41 grandchildren, and 7 great-grandchildren. Clarence dedicated his life to his Christian faith and volunteered as a firefighter. Just like his father, he moved back to Hartford to work on his uncle's mayoral campaign. In addition to supporting his uncle's successful bid to become the city's first African-American mayor, Clarence also committed himself to running several businesses.

Family was at the heart of everything Clarence did. He was inseparable from his identical twin, Carl, for many years. Clarence met his wife in Hartford and spent as much time as possible with all of his children and grandchildren. He passed away on January 11, 2022, at the age of 64.

My wife Cynthia and I extend our deepest sympathies to former Mayor Milner and all of Nelson and Clarence's loved ones. May their many wonderful memories of both men provide them solace and comfort in the days ahead. I hope my colleagues will join me in remembering Nelson W. Milner, Sr., and Clarence R. Milner, Sr. •

RECOGNIZING THE STEWART INDIAN SCHOOL CULTURAL CENTER AND MUSEUM

• Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I come forward today to recognize the

grand opening of the Stewart Indian School Cultural Center and Museum. Three miles south of Carson City, the Stewart Indian School opened in 1890 with the official purpose of addressing Indigenous education. In reality, students were made to forget their Native languages and were allowed little to no contact with family members for decades, thereby destroying important cultural and social connections. Today, Stewart Indian School is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and remains open as an important educational and historic landmark in Nevada.

After its closing in 1982, the State of Nevada assumed the property and began taking steps to reconcile its painful history with our community. Most notably, it returned 130 acres of land to the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California. Since then, the Nevada Indian Commission has worked hard to preserve the history and stories of its alumni. In 2008, it helped establish a self-guided walking tour of the campus, and in 2015, it worked with the Nevada State Legislature to secure funding for a museum director and curator for the location. With the help of volunteers and staff, members of this museum have worked hard to record and display only some of the 30,000 Stewart Indian School alumni stories, with many members being alumni or descendants themselves.

On May 11 of this year, the U.S. Interior Department released the Federal Indian Boarding School Initiative Investigative Report that summarized the treatment of Indigenous children in over 400 boarding schools across the country. The report unveils heart-breaking findings. Many of these children were taken from their communities and were forced to attend these schools. While there, they often faced rampant emotional, sexual, and physical abuse. The report also makes it clear that, from the beginning, these schools were designed to strip children of their Indigenous identities. The resulting trauma impacted families for generations, and some parents went as far as refusing to teach their children their Native language or ways of life for fear that they too would be severely punished in school for expressing themselves. Stewart Indian School stands here today as one of these former 408 boarding schools.

I would like to commend the efforts of the Nevada Indian Commission, of museum directors and staff, and of alumni and their descendants who have made the official grand opening of the Stewart Indian School Cultural Center and Museum possible. It is important that we recognize the history of our community and acknowledge the testimonies of all those who continue to endure the pain and loss that resulted from decades of separation and cultural erasure. Finally, thank you to all of those who bravely shared and publicized their stories so that we may learn a bit more and work to never forget. •

TRIBUTE TO CAROLE JOHNSON

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today I have the distinct honor of recognizing Carole Johnson of Mineral County for her dedication to the Forest Service and her 50-plus years of public service to the people of Montana.

Raised in Superior, MT, Carole graduated from Montana State University—"Go Cats!"—and joined the U.S. Forest Service in 1971. Carole started as a seasonal recreational employee on the Superior Ranger District of the Lolo National Forest and has since worked in nearly every facet of the Forest Service including firefighting, logistics, silviculture, surveying, mining, and conservation education. In 2015, Carole was named Superior District ranger, the post she held until retiring earlier this spring. According to most accounts, at the time of her retirement, Carole was the longest tenured federal employee in the State of Montana.

Anyone who knows Carole will tell you that she exemplifies the definition of a public servant. For more than 50 years, she served her community with unmatched institutional knowledge and professionalism. She has been a voice of reason in debates over public lands management emphasizing that forest management and conservation go hand in hand. As district ranger, Carole worked tirelessly to increase the timber output on the Superior District to help benefit the local economy and support wildfire mitigation in the community.

Outside of her role with the Forest Service, Carole is active in her community. She serves on many boards including the Mineral Community Hospital Board, Mineral Fair Board and the Glacier Country Tourism Board. Through her commitment to public service, it is clear that Carole has long been a well-respected and beloved member of the Mineral County community.

It is my honor to recognize Carole for her dedication to the Forest Service and her 50-plus years of public service to the great State of Montana. Carole, thank you for your many years of public service and commitment to improving our public lands and forests. I wish you all the best in your retirement. You make Montana proud. •

TRIBUTE TO KAREN GOODE

• Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, it is an honor to pay tribute today to Ms. Karen Goode, who has retired after 47 years of dedicated public service with the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Regional Office in Jackson, MS. Since becoming a U.S. Senator in 2018, I have come to appreciate Ms. Goode who has earned consistent high praise from my State office staff responsible for assisting veterans with their VA claims. Karen's knowledge, responsiveness, reliability, and trustworthiness have enabled me to serve Mississippi's

veterans better and more effectively, and I am very thankful to her for that.

Karen began her career with the VA in 1975 in a clerical position with the finance department. A GS-3 at the time she was hired, Karen is retiring as a GS-13 supervisory veterans service representative, which is evidence of her meritorious work leading to continual promotions throughout her Federal civil service career. In the process, she acquired the knowledge and skill sets for processing all claims for compensation, pension, education, vocational, and rehabilitation. Ms. Goode's thorough understanding of the claims review process, along with her excellent management skills, propelled her into key senior leadership roles that led her to supervising seven different employee teams over her VA career.

Ms. Goode's high degree of professionalism earned her multiple special recognitions. At the recommendation of the veterans service center manager, Karen in 2006 served as the representative for the southern area on a quality assurance detail HELP team in Washington, DC. In 2012, at the completion of a designated special project as quality team coach, Karen obtained Lean Six Sigma Green Belt designation.

Even though Congress writes the laws regarding veterans' benefits, it is up to teams set up within the VA to review veterans' claims and determine if they are eligible for benefits. It can be a complex and lengthy process, which I highly respect. Covering a broad range of benefit categories, I understand the effectiveness in which VA team member groups review and process claims can differ greatly. Despite exercising most of her leadership away from the public eye, Mississippi's veterans are fortunate to have been served by Ms. Karen Goode for so many years working in this capacity. She has been unwavering in her commitment to ensuring that Mississippi's veterans receive the benefits to which they are entitled under the law.

In conclusion, I am incredibly grateful to Ms. Karen Goode for dedicating her career to serving those who have served our country. I commend her for her many accomplishments, and I send her my best wishes for an enjoyable retirement.●

TRIBUTE TO DANA TOTMAN

Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Dana Totman for his 22 years of service at Avesta Housing and congratulate him on a well-deserved retirement. Under his leadership, Avesta Housing became northern New England's largest housing nonprofit and transformed the lives of individuals and families across Maine. Dana has been a tireless advocate for affordable housing and made it clear how drastically it improves lives and strengthens communities.

While Dana cares about the bricks and mortar that become the homes of many, he cares most about the people

who get to call these places home. It is these individuals who drive his passion. The Maine Affordable Housing Coalition, created by Dana, exemplifies his vision by giving those in need a voice and the ability to advocate for themselves.

During the 2009 recession, Dana found a creative way to increase the supply of affordable homes through the development of a \$50 million bond proposal. Known as the Green Affordable Housing Bond, this allowed low-income Mainers to obtain affordable, energy-efficient homes, and created jobs in the construction, architectural, and engineering sectors. Subsequently, when Maine seniors needed a voice for their growing housing needs, Dana created and promoted the \$15 million Maine Affordable Housing Bond, the effort garnered support from 69 percent of Maine voters—one of the largest margin wins of a State bond initiative.

Throughout his career, Dana navigated through the many obstacles and challenges Avesta Housing faced. His humility and quiet demeanor brought people and organizations together to demonstrate how affordable housing significantly strengthens communities' well-being. His ability to work closely with neighbors, listen to concerns, and understand the whole picture, furthered Avesta Housing's mission of giving everyone, regardless of socioeconomic status, age, or race, a chance to have a home.

Dana was raised on a Topsham dairy farm, and later lived in Brunswick, where he and his wife raised their two sons and were members of the school community as parents. Dana also volunteered to coach soccer and baseball teams, imparting many life lessons to the kids. He continues to mentor young people, inspiring future generations to dedicate their lives to giving back to their communities.

Maine's business community has recognized Dana multiple times over the years for his exceptional leadership and contributions to equitable housing in Maine. It is a privilege to join with his colleagues, friends, and the people of Maine in recognizing Dana for demonstrating innovation, true excellence in his work, and unwavering compassion to those seeking—and finding—a home.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:04 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 3580. An act to amend title 46, United States Code, with respect to prohibited acts by ocean common carriers or marine terminal operators, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2020. An act to provide for an online repository for certain reporting require-

ments for recipients of Federal disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6270. An act to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a pilot program to provide grants related to advanced air mobility infrastructure, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 3:51 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 3580. An act to amend title 46, United States Code, with respect to prohibited acts by ocean common carriers or marine terminal operators, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2020. An act to provide for an online repository for certain reporting requirements for recipients of Federal disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4292. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Equal Credit Opportunity (Regulation B); Revocations or Unfavorable Changes to the Terms of Existing Credit Arrangements" (12 CFR Part 1002) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 9, 2022; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4293. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Enterprise Regulatory Capital Framework - Public Disclosures for the Standardized Approach" (RIN2590-AB18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2022; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4294. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Affordable Housing Program - Technical Revisions" (RIN2590-AB08) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2022; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4295. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13466 with respect to North Korea; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4296. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13851 with respect to Nicaragua; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4297. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13219 with respect to the Western Balkans; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4298. A communication from the Chairman of the Appraisal Subcommittee, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Appraisal Subcommittee's 2021 Annual Report; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4299. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Housing and Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2022; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4300. A communication from the President and Chair of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Bank's Annual Performance Plan for fiscal year 2023, and the Annual Performance Report for fiscal year 2021; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4301. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Direct Heating Equipment" (RIN1904-AE30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 9, 2022; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Con. Res. 40. A concurrent resolution welcoming the Prime Minister of Greece to the United States for an address to a joint meeting of Congress.

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 124. A resolution celebrating the heritage of Romani Americans.

S. Res. 394. A resolution recognizing the 25th anniversary of Radio Free Asia and its mission to provide an independent source of news to closed societies in Asia.

S. Res. 458. A resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations Children's Fund.

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 540. A resolution supporting the goals of International Women's Day.

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 568. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Countering International Parental Child Abduction Month" and expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should raise awareness of the harm caused by international parental child abduction.

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 589. A resolution recognizing, honoring, and commending the women of Ukraine who have contributed to the fight for freedom and the defense of Ukraine.

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and with a preamble:

S. Res. 638. A resolution commending the Government and people of the Republic of Moldova for their heroic efforts to support Ukrainian refugees fleeing President Putin's illegal war against Ukraine.

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 646. A resolution expressing the Senate's support for Finland and Sweden's accession into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the expedited ratification of accession protocols.

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1160. A bill to prioritize efforts of the Department of State to combat international trafficking in covered synthetic drugs and new psychoactive substances, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DURBIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2151. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide that COPS grant funds may be used for local law enforcement recruits to attend schools or academies if the recruits agree to serve in precincts of law enforcement agencies in their communities.

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 3211. A bill to continue the whole-of-government approach to ending global wildlife poaching and trafficking by permanently re-authorizing the activities of the Presidential Task Force on Wildlife Trafficking, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DURBIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 3635. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize public safety officer death benefits to officers suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder or acute stress disorder, and for other purposes.

S. 3860. A bill to establish a grant program to provide assistance to local governments with fewer than 200 law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 3861. A bill to require the Secretary of State to submit annual reports to Congress on the assistance provided to Somaliland and to conduct a feasibility study, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, on establishing a security partnership with Somaliland, without recognizing Somaliland as an independent state.

S. 3895. A bill to extend and authorize annual appropriations for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom through fiscal year 2024.

By Mr. DURBIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 4003. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for training on alternatives to use of force, de-escalation, and mental and behavioral health and suicidal crises.

S. 4007. A bill to require the Attorney General to propose a program for making treatment for post-traumatic stress disorder and acute stress disorder available to public safety officers, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 4171. A bill to reauthorize the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

H.R. 4250. An act to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to provide for rewards for the arrest or conviction of certain foreign nationals who have committed genocide or war crimes, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7276. An act to direct the President to submit to Congress a report on United States Government efforts to collect, analyze, and preserve evidence and information related to war crimes and other atrocities committed during the full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine since February 24, 2022, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MANCHIN for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

*David Applegate, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the United States Geological Survey.

*Evelyn Wang, of Massachusetts, to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, Department of Energy.

*Carmen G. Cantor, of Puerto Rico, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 4388. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to waive cost-sharing under the TRICARE program for three mental health outpatient visits per year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 4389. A bill to provide for the abolition of certain United Nations groups, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 4390. A bill to require summary approval information with respect to certain approved drugs and biological products; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 4391. A bill to establish rules for export certification of devices manufactured outside of the United States; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 4392. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program on the use of sustainable aviation fuel by the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. DAINES, Mr.

LANKFORD, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 4393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the maximum capital gains tax rate, to modify the tax on net investment income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 4394. A bill to modify the minimum required weight of orange juice soluble solids; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 4395. A bill to allow grantees under the HIV Health Care Services Program to allocate a portion of such funding for services to individuals at risk of acquiring HIV; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 4396. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on providing benefits under TRICARE Reserve Select and the TRICARE dental program to members of the Selected Reserve and their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANFORD:

S. 4397. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to build capacity for counter-unmanned aircraft systems operations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 4398. A bill to allow Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Program assistance be used to reduce racial and ethnic disparities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 4399. A bill to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 4400. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for special roll-overs to Roth IRAs from long-term qualified tuition programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 4401. A bill to modify the Freedom of Information Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 4402. A bill to direct the Attorney General to establish a grant program to establish, implement, and administer the violent incident clearance and technology investigative method, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 4403. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for a civics and history education program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. KING, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 4404. A bill to authorize certain actions to address domestic industrial base shortfalls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. Res. 670. A resolution encouraging the Secretary of the Air Force to designate the Maine Air National Guard 101st Air Refueling Wing as a center of excellence for additive manufacturing technology; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. LEE):

S. Res. 671. A resolution celebrating the 245th anniversary of the creation of the flag of the United States and expressing support for the Pledge of Allegiance; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 672. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2022 as "Stroke Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. Res. 673. A resolution authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to prepare a revised edition of the Standing Rules of the Senate as a Senate document; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. Res. 674. A resolution celebrating the 75th anniversary of the Marshall Plan and recognizing the role of the Marshall Plan as the foundation of a transatlantic community committed to the preservation of peace, prosperity, and democracy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 467

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 467, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program to improve the identification, assessment, and treatment of patients in hospital emergency departments who are at risk of suicide, and for other purposes.

S. 749

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 749, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance tax benefits for research activities.

S. 809

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 809, a bill to encourage and facilitate efforts by States and other stakeholders to conserve and sustain the western population of monarch butterflies, and for other purposes.

S. 1116

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr.

WYDEN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1116, a bill to amend chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, to create a presumption that a disability or death of a Federal employee in fire protection activities caused by any of certain diseases is the result of the performance of such employees duty, and for other purposes.

S. 1151

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1151, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a presumption of service connected disability for certain veterans who served in Palomares, Spain, and for other purposes.

S. 1378

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1378, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to allow for the retirement of certain animals used in Federal research, and for other purposes.

S. 1388

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1388, a bill to require the Federal Trade Commission to study the role of intermediaries in the pharmaceutical supply chain and provide Congress with appropriate policy recommendations, and for other purposes.

S. 1489

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1489, a bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to establish an Inspector General of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and for other purposes.

S. 1530

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1530, a bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to make breakfasts and lunches free for all children, and for other purposes.

S. 1532

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1532, a bill to provide a work opportunity tax credit for military spouses and to provide for flexible spending arrangements for childcare services for uniformed services families.

S. 1544

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1544, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to streamline enrollment under the Medicaid program of certain providers

across State lines, and for other purposes.

S. 2280

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2280, a bill to provide PreCheck to certain severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2340

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2340, a bill to improve the safety and security of the Federal judiciary.

S. 2569

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2569, a bill to enhance the rights of domestic workers, and for other purposes.

S. 2920

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2920, a bill to provide downpayment assistance to first-generation homebuyers to address multigenerational inequities in access to homeownership and to narrow and ultimately close the racial homeownership gap in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 3021

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3021, a bill to provide non-medical counseling services for military families.

S. 3091

At the request of Mr. OSSOFF, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3091, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish the advanced solar manufacturing production credit.

S. 3293

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3293, a bill to expand access of veterans to mental health care from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 3318

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3318, a bill to deter foreign financial institutions from providing banking services for the benefit of foreign terrorist organizations and from facilitating or promoting payments for acts of terrorism.

S. 3421

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator

from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 3421, a bill to clarify that section 107 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act applies sanctions with respect to unmanned combat aerial vehicles following a 2019 change by the United Nations providing additional clarity to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

S. 3607

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3607, a bill to award a Congressional gold medal, collectively, to the First Rhode Island Regiment, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Revolutionary War.

S. 3909

At the request of Mr. Kaine, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 3909, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make employers of spouses of military personnel eligible for the work opportunity credit.

S. 4105

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 4105, a bill to treat certain liquidations of new motor vehicle inventory as qualified liquidations of LIFO inventory for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

S. 4111

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 4111, a bill to support research and State management efforts relating to chronic wasting disease, and for other purposes.

S. 4120

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4120, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 4127

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4127, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to address disclosures by directors, officers, and principal stockholders of foreign private issuers, and for other purposes.

S. 4161

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4161, a bill to establish ef-

fluent limitations guidelines and standards and water quality criteria for perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and for other purposes.

S. 4171

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4171, a bill to reauthorize the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, and for other purposes.

S. 4182

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4182, a bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes.

S. 4202

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4202, a bill to require an annual budget estimate for the initiatives of the National Institutes of Health pursuant to reports and recommendations made under the National Alzheimer's Project Act.

S. 4278

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4278, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the purchase of certain firearms by individuals under 21 years of age, and for other purposes.

S. 4293

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4293, a bill to prevent unfair and deceptive acts or practices and the dissemination of false information related to pharmacy benefit management services for prescription drugs, and for other purposes.

S. 4359

At the request of Mr. OSSOFF, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4359, a bill to designate the regional office of the Department of Veterans Affairs in metropolitan Atlanta as the "Senator Johnny Isakson Department of Veterans Affairs Atlanta Regional Office", and for other purposes.

S. 4369

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 4369, a bill to allow States and local educational agencies to use any remaining COVID-19 elementary and secondary school emergency relief funds for school security measures.

S. 4376

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4376, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, relating to sentencing of armed career criminals.

S.J. RES. 20

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 20, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 4393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the maximum capital gains tax rate, to modify the tax on net investment income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to tell my colleagues about a bill I am introducing today to encourage savings. To set the stage for the necessity of that bill, I am going to speak for a minute about the obstacles that this administration's economic policies—particularly inflation—have put in that give need for such legislation.

On Friday, we learned that inflation surged to 8.6 percent, a new 40-year high for inflation. Inflation is the No. 1 concern that I hear from Iowans as I do my 99-county tour throughout the State over the course of a year. I hear how rising prices, particularly for food and energy, are cutting into budgets, making it difficult to make ends meet.

Moreover, I hear from Iowans who are concerned that inflation is eating into their savings. That gets to the purpose of the legislation I am going to soon talk about. This is particularly true for seniors who are living on fixed budgets and are dependent on their savings and investment income to keep their heads above water.

Yet President Biden and congressional Democrats continue to ignore the damage done by their reckless tax-and-spending agenda. Sadly, their solu-

tion for inflation is just more of the same old Democratic tax-and-spend agenda. We still hear rumors that there may be some version of Build Back Better. Just think. If that original version of Build Back Better had passed, we would have had another \$4.5 trillion in additional spending feeding the fires of inflation. Thank God for 50 Republicans and Senator MANCHIN that that has not happened.

Several Democrats have argued for hiking taxes to combat inflation. However, their proposed tax hikes on job creators would suppress business investment, lowering productivity. This would be counterproductive at a time when consumers' demands far outpace supply. We need more production, not less, to combat unchecked inflation.

Moreover, the proposed Democratic tax hikes would be passed on to the middle class in the form of lower wages and higher prices. These tax hikes would further squeeze a middle class that is already enduring the worst of inflation.

I just complimented Senator MANCHIN for putting a stop to Build Back Better. When it comes to some of the original tax policies we have heard from the Democrats, we can thank Senator SINEMA, another Democrat, for stepping in and bringing at least some common sense to tax policy, even though it wasn't a complete change of that tax policy. Raising taxes on job creation isn't the only misguided tax proposal. While many consumer products are in short supply, ill-conceived Democratic proposals are not.

In addition to reckless tax hikes on businesses broadly, Democrats have proposed providing consumer gas rebates, forgiving student loan debt, imposing windfall profit taxes on oil and gas, and implementing price controls. None of these proposals would help tamp down inflation. Instead, they would only make things worse—much worse.

Instead of providing relief, gas rebates would increase demand, driving prices higher. Forgiving student loans would have a similar effect and would be horribly counterproductive and, at the same time, would be very unfair to those students who have already paid off their student loans.

Yet you don't have to take CHUCK GRASSLEY's word for it. Prominent Democratic economist Larry Summers has said that student debt cancellation would be "regressive, uncertainty creating, untargeted and inappropriate at a time when the economy is [already] overheated."

Windfall profit taxes and price controls may be the worst of all of the proposals.

That should have been learned from the Nixon administration when he froze prices and wages. It was a disaster—part of the cause of the great inflation of the 1970s. There were disastrous consequences then as a result of what happened in the 1970s. Anyone who lived through that time can tell

you how these policies made things worse by reducing supply. The result was of rampant shortages, most notably with gas lines all around the block.

When addressing inflation, Congress must be guided by the principle: First, do no harm. The Democrats' proposal has failed this principle miserably.

The fact of the matter is that, once the inflation fire gets started, it is hard to put out. Just think: Just a few months ago, inflation was transitory, and then it got up to 6 percent, 7 percent, 8.3 percent. Then somebody said last month that it was going to cool off, but it is up to 8.6 percent. The Federal Reserve is best suited for reining in inflation given its control over the money supply.

As Milton Friedman said:

Inflation is always and everywhere a monetary phenomenon.

This doesn't mean Congress is helpless when it comes to responding to inflation. The most important thing that Congress can do is stop spending like drunken sailors. Even better would be to trim the budget to eliminate unnecessary spending.

Congress can also provide targeted inflation relief. However, it must be done in a way that won't add to our growing debt or further fuel the flames of inflation. One way to do this is by providing targeted inflation relief that incentivizes and rewards taxpayers who save rather than spend.

With today's high inflation, many in the middle class could see most or even all of their savings and investment gains wiped out by the inflation that is upon us. Yet, even though middle class savers may be losing money in real terms, they are still taxed on all gains and interest income as if inflation doesn't exist. This creates a perverse incentive that encourages taxpayers to consume today rather than to save today. This can push up the demand for goods and services, forcing prices higher and further fueling inflation.

To help counter the current bias in favor of consumption, I now come to my proposal, a proposal subjecting most middle class savings and investment income to zero tax.

Now, this isn't a silver bullet in the fight against inflation. Ultimately, the Federal Reserve will have to do the heavy lifting. However, unlike counterproductive Democrat policies, my proposals would incentivize and reward saving. As a result, it would get relief to the middle class without further fueling consumer demand or reducing production and supply.

The title of the bill is the "Middle-Class Savings and Investment Act." Under that bill, taxpayers in the 22-percent individual income tax bracket and lower would pay zero tax on their long-term capital gains and dividend income. Moreover, my proposal would allow individuals to exclude a reasonable amount of interest income from tax. For 2022, the combination of those proposals means an individual with a taxable income of below \$89,075 or a

married couple below \$178,150 would largely be able to save tax-free.

In addition to exempting the middle class from the tax on most of their savings and investment income, my proposal would enhance and expand the saver's credit. This provides a tax credit to low- to middle-income taxpayers who contribute to a tax-favored retirement account. My proposal would increase the maximum credit amount by \$500 for married taxpayers and expand eligibility to more taxpayers.

Finally, my proposal would address a massive marriage penalty that is gradually catching ever more taxpayers by surprise thanks just simply to inflation. Under ObamaCare, Democrats imposed a new 3.8-percent tax on investment income of taxpayers earning over \$200,000 single or \$250,000 married. Congress never indexed these thresholds for inflation; thus, given current inflation, it is likely it won't be long before millions of middle-class taxpayers find themselves squarely within the grasp of that marriage penalty. To prevent this, I index the income threshold for this tax to inflation. Moreover, I eliminate the marriage penalty by raising the threshold for married taxpayers to twice that for single earners.

Of course, any relief provided must be fully paid for to ensure that we aren't just adding unsustainable debt and deficits. This is why my proposal is fully paid for by extending the \$10,000 cap on State and local tax deductions beyond the current scheduled expiration at the end of 2025.

The SALT deduction is a highly regressive tax subsidy that primarily benefits high-income taxpayers. According to the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation, more than half of the benefits from lifting the SALT cap would go to those making over \$1 million a year. Extending the current cap on SALT—an otherwise highly regressive tax benefit—to provide immediate inflation relief to the middle class should be a no-brainer to all of my colleagues.

I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to support this proposal.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 670—ENCOURAGING THE SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE TO DESIGNATE THE MAINE AIR NATIONAL GUARD 101ST AIR REFUELING WING AS A CENTER OF EXCELLENCE FOR ADDITIVE MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY

Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 670

Whereas the 101st Air Refueling Wing is home to four technicians certified to print airworthy parts, two-thirds of the entire uniformed force of certified technicians;

Whereas the 101st Air Refueling Wing is the only Air National Guard unit capable of printing airworthy parts, while also fielding the technicians certified to print airworthy parts;

Whereas the 101st Air Refueling Wing has created eight different tools for six different maintenance shops, enhancing aircrew maintenance efficiency and increasing aircraft readiness;

Whereas the 101st Air Refueling Wing has modeled and provided three training aids allowing complete comprehensive drill status guardsmen training, resulting in increased technician competency, and superior aircraft maintenance repairs;

Whereas the 101st Air Refueling Wing has the ability to model and prove a well-fitting part before machining, allowing for easier identification of errors, and preventing the duplication of non-usable parts, increasing aircraft readiness and reducing material waste and cost;

Whereas the 101st Air Refueling Wing is the only Air National Guard unit to have an authorized polymer printer in their possession;

Whereas the 101st Air Refueling Wing partners with the University of Maine Advanced Structures and Composites Department;

Whereas this allows both organizations to share the best practices and emerging technologies, while also allowing the 101st to perform strength testing of part candidates and receive feedback for redesign options;

Whereas the 101st Air Refueling Wing has created five jigs or fixtures which significantly aid aircrews in making repairs, while also decreasing aircraft downtime and repair inaccuracy;

Whereas the 101st Air Refueling Wing has modeled five aircraft parts as proofs of design before machining replacement parts, successfully identifying model errors and reducing material waste and cost; and

Whereas the Army Reserve 75th Innovation Command requested that the 101st Air Refueling Wing model and produce five parts as a pilot program connecting units with additive manufacturing stations capable of supporting modeling and printing requests: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to designate the Maine Air National Guard 101st Air Refueling Wing at Bangor Air National Guard Base as a center of excellence for additive manufacturing technology.

SENATE RESOLUTION 671—CELEBRATING THE 245TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CREATION OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. LEE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 671

Whereas on June 14, 1777, the Continental Congress approved the design of a flag of the United States;

Whereas, over the years, the flag of the United States has preserved the standards of the original design comprised of alternating red and white stripes accompanied by a union consisting of white stars on a field of blue;

Whereas, on May 30, 1916, President Woodrow Wilson issued Presidential Proclamation

1335, an announcement asking the people of the United States to observe June 14 as Flag Day;

Whereas, on August 3, 1949, President Harry Truman signed into law House Joint Resolution 170, 81st Congress, a joint resolution designating June 14 of each year as Flag Day;

Whereas, on August 21, 1959, President Dwight Eisenhower issued Executive Order 10834 (24 Fed. Reg. 6865), an order establishing the most recent design of the flag of the United States;

Whereas the Pledge of Allegiance was written by Francis Bellamy, a Baptist minister, and first published in the September 8, 1892, issue of *The Youth's Companion*;

Whereas, in 1954, Congress added the words "under God" to the Pledge of Allegiance;

Whereas, for more than 60 years, the Pledge of Allegiance has included references to the United States flag, to the United States having been established as a union "under God", and to the United States being dedicated to securing "liberty and justice for all";

Whereas, in 1954, Congress believed it was acting constitutionally when it revised the Pledge of Allegiance;

Whereas the United States was founded on principles of religious freedom by the Founders, many of whom were deeply religious;

Whereas the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States embodies principles intended to guarantee freedom of religion through the free exercise thereof and by prohibiting the Government from establishing a religion;

Whereas patriotic songs, engravings on United States legal tender, and engravings on Federal buildings also contain general references to "God";

Whereas, in *Elk Grove Unified School District v. Newdow*, 542 U.S. 1 (2004), the Supreme Court of the United States overturned the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Newdow v. U.S. Congress*, 328 F.3d 466 (9th Cir. 2003), a case in which the Ninth Circuit concluded that recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance by a public school teacher violated the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit subsequently concluded that—

(1) the previous opinion of that court in *Newdow v. U.S. Congress*, 328 F.3d 466 (9th Cir. 2003) was no longer binding precedent;

(2) case law from the Supreme Court of the United States concerning the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States had subsequently changed after the decision in *Elk Grove Unified School District v. Newdow*, 542 U.S. 1 (2004); and

(3) Congress, in passing the new version of the Pledge of Allegiance, had established a secular purpose for the use of the term "under God"; and

Whereas, in light of those conclusions, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit upheld the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance by public school teachers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates the 245th anniversary of the creation of the flag of the United States;

(2) recognizes that the Pledge of Allegiance has been a valuable part of life for the people of the United States for generations; and

(3) affirms that the Pledge of Allegiance is a constitutional expression of patriotism, and strongly defends the constitutionality of the Pledge of Allegiance.

SENATE RESOLUTION 672—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 2022 AS “STROKE AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 672

Whereas stroke, also known as a cerebrovascular accident, is an acute neurological injury that occurs when the blood supply to a part of the brain is interrupted by a clot in the artery or a burst of the artery;

Whereas stroke is a medical emergency that can cause permanent neurological damage, or even death, if not promptly diagnosed and treated;

Whereas, in the United States, stroke is now the fifth leading cause of death;

Whereas, in the United States, someone has a stroke every 40 seconds, and someone dies of stroke every 3.5 minutes;

Whereas approximately 795,000 people in the United States have a stroke each year;

Whereas the stroke-related costs in the United States came to nearly \$53,000,000,000 between 2017 and 2018, including the cost of healthcare services, medicines to treat stroke, and missed days of work;

Whereas stroke is a leading cause of serious long-term disability;

Whereas those disabilities may require ongoing physical, occupational, speech-language, and other therapy and surgeries;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention advises that the most effective stroke treatments are available only if the stroke is recognized and diagnosed within 3 hours of the first symptoms and recommends the public be familiar with and use the mnemonic F.A.S.T. to identify the signs and symptoms of stroke;

Whereas the F.A.S.T. mnemonic describes the symptoms of stroke, the methods for assessing those symptoms, and the actions to take in response to those symptoms and stands for—

(1) face drooping, observable when the person smiles and one side of the face droops;

(2) arm weakness, observable when both arms are raised and one arm drifts downward;

(3) speech difficulty, observable when asking the person to repeat a simple phrase and the speech is slurred or strange; and

(4) time to call 9–1–1, if any of these symptoms are present; and

Whereas the permanent health concerns and treatments resulting from stroke have a considerable impact on children, families, and society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of May 2022 as “Stroke Awareness Month” to increase awareness and education so that people in the United States know their risk factors and obtain treatment early;

(2) encourages the people of the United States to support the efforts, programs, services, and advocacy of organizations that work to enhance public awareness of stroke; and

(3) encourages continued coordination and cooperation between government, researchers, families, and the public to improve prognoses by increasing access to timely treatments for individuals who suffer strokes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 673—AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION TO PREPARE A REVISED EDITION OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 673

Resolved, SECTION 1. PRINTING THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE.

(a) AUTHORIZATIONS.—The Committee on Rules and Administration shall prepare a revised edition of the Standing Rules of the Senate and such standing rules shall be printed as a Senate document.

(b) ADDITIONAL COPIES.—In addition to the usual number, 1,750 additional copies shall be printed for use by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SENATE RESOLUTION 674—CELEBRATING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MARSHALL PLAN AND RECOGNIZING THE ROLE OF THE MARSHALL PLAN AS THE FOUNDATION OF A TRANS-ATLANTIC COMMUNITY COMMITTED TO THE PRESERVATION OF PEACE, PROSPERITY, AND DEMOCRACY

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 674

Whereas, after World War II, the infrastructure, factories, and cities of Europe were in ruins and the people of Europe were in danger of famine and destitution;

Whereas, in a commencement address on June 5, 1947, at Harvard University, then-Secretary of State George C. Marshall proposed the framework of the Economic Recovery Program (commonly known as the “Marshall Plan”);

Whereas, in his address, Secretary Marshall declared that the Marshall Plan would be successful only with “foresight, and a willingness on the part of our people to face up to the vast responsibility which history has clearly placed upon our country”;

Whereas a bipartisan coalition of Congress overwhelmingly approved the Marshall Plan through the passage of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, which was signed by President Harry Truman on April 3, 1948;

Whereas, in that Act, Congress acknowledged that the “intimate economic and other relationships between the United States and the nations of Europe” and recognized that peace and general welfare on the European continent are in the national interest of the United States;

Whereas the Marshall Plan helped rebuild a battered Europe, restore peace and political stability, and reinforce democracy across the continent;

Whereas, under the Marshall Plan, the United States extended an offer of aid to all countries in Europe, without prejudice, including to the then-Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

Whereas the Marshall Plan served as the foundation for transatlantic engagement and cooperation, which led to the establishment of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO);

Whereas continued Euro-Atlantic integration and cooperation are key to the protection of peace and transatlantic values;

Whereas the brutal and unprovoked invasion of Ukraine by Vladimir Putin, launched on February 24, 2022, threatens the peace and principles at the core of the transatlantic community;

Whereas continued transatlantic cooperation is vital to holding Vladimir Putin to account for his war of choice against the Ukrainian people, and supporting Ukraine as it defends its sovereignty and territorial integrity amidst unconscionable war crimes committed by the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation;

Whereas the United States, in cooperation with its allies and partners, is committed to helping rebuild and protect the democratic Government of Ukraine;

Whereas direct investment in the United States by European countries exceeds trillions of dollars annually, which is a direct result of the prosperous economy in Europe that was aided by investments of the United States; and

Whereas the German Marshall Fund of the United States, which celebrates its 50th anniversary in 2022, was established with a gift from Germany to express appreciation for the support the United States provided to Europe in the aftermath of World War II: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates the 75th anniversary of the Economic Recovery Program (commonly known as the “Marshall Plan”);

(2) recognizes the role of the Marshall Plan in founding a transatlantic community committed to the preservation of peace, prosperity, and democracy;

(3) reaffirms that cooperation with allies and partners in the transatlantic community to protect shared values and principles is in the national interest of the United States; and

(4) congratulates the German Marshall Fund of the United States on its 50th anniversary and expresses appreciation for its work to champion cooperation between the United States and allies and partners in Europe.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 5095. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5051 proposed by Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3967, to improve health care and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5096. Ms. HASSAN (for Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1787, to amend title 28 of the United States Code to prevent the transfer of actions arising under the antitrust laws in which a State is a complainant.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 5095. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5051 proposed by Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. MORAN) to the bill H.R. 3967, to improve health care and benefits for veterans exposed to toxic substances, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 118, strike line 9 and all that follows through page 120, line 7, and insert the following:

“(C) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—(1) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Fund for fiscal year 2023 and each subsequent fiscal year such sums as are necessary, pursuant to the limitation in paragraph (2), to increase funding, over the fiscal year 2021 level, for investment in—

“(A) the delivery of veterans’ health care associated with exposure to environmental hazards in the active military, naval, air, or space service in programs administered by the Under Secretary for Health;

“(B) any expenses incident to the delivery of veterans’ health care and benefits associated with exposure to environmental hazards in the active military, naval, air, or space service, including administrative expenses, such as information technology and claims processing and appeals, and excluding leases as authorized or approved under section 8104 of this title; and

“(C) medical and other research relating to exposure to environmental hazards.

“(2) LIMITATION.—For the period of fiscal years 2023 through 2031, amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Fund may not exceed a cumulative total of \$116,800,000,000.

“(d) BUDGET SCOREKEEPING.—(1) Immediately upon enactment of the Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring our Promise to Address Comprehensive Toxics Act of 2022, expenses authorized to be appropriated to the Fund in subsection (c) shall be estimated for fiscal year 2023 through fiscal year 2031 and treated as budget authority that is considered to be direct spending—

“(A) in the baseline for purposes of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907);

“(B) by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the Chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, as appropriate, for purposes of budget enforcement in the Senate and the House of Representatives;

“(C) under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.), including in the reports required by section 308(b) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 639); and

“(D) for purposes of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 931 et seq.).

“(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), amounts appropriated to the Fund for fiscal years 2023 through 2031 pursuant to this section shall be counted as direct spending under the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) and any other Act.

“(B) Any amounts appropriated to the Fund in excess of the amount specified under subsection (c)(2) shall be scored as discretionary budget authority and outlays for any estimate of an appropriations Act.”.

SA 5096. Ms. HASSAN (for Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1787, to amend title 28 of the United States Code to prevent the transfer of actions arising under the antitrust laws in which a State is a complainant; as follows:

Strike section 3.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have 14 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 14, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 14, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 14, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 14, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 14, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans’ Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 14, 2022, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 14, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIRLAND

The Subcommittee on Airland of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 14, 2022, at 5:30 p.m., to conduct a closed business meeting.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY

The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 14, 2022, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed business meeting.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 14, 2022, at 11 a.m., to conduct a closed business meeting.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND SPENDING OVERSIGHT

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Spending Oversight of the

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 14, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

The Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 14, 2022, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

The Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 14, 2022, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

The Subcommittee on Sea power of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 14, 2022, at 5 p.m., to conduct a closed business meeting.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 2022

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, June 15; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 388, H.R. 3967; further, that all time during adjournment, recess, morning business, and leader remarks count postcloture, and that all time be considered expired at 11:45 a.m.; further, that at 5:15 p.m. the Senate execute the orders with respect to the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 397, S. Con. Res. 41, and the Leventhal nomination, in the order listed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. HASSAN. For information of Senators, there will be two votes at 11:45 a.m. and two votes at 5:15 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:55 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 15, 2022, at 10 a.m.